

A N

Epistolary Discourse,

Proving, from the

Scriptures and the **First Fathers,**

THAT THE

S O U L

Is a Principle *Naturally Mortal:*

But Immortalized Actually: by the
Pleasure of God to Punishment; or, to Reward
by its Union with the Divine Baptismal Spirit.

Wherein is Proved,

That None have the Power of Giving this Divine
Immortalizing Spirit, since the Apostles, but only
BISHOPS.

With an Hypothesis concerning *Sacerdotal Absolution.*

The Second Edition, with large Additions, and Corrected
from great Erratas by the Author's own Hand.

By **HENRY DODWELL, A. M.**

*That better part of us—in and after Death doth exist and
live, either by virtue of its Spiritual and Immortal Nature, as
we believe; or, at least the Will of God and his Power upholding
and preserving it from Dissolution, as many of the Fathers
thought. Bishop Pearson on the Creed, Art. V. p. 235,
236. 5th Edit. Lond. 1683.*

LONDON: Printed for R. Smith, and Sold by John
Phillips, at the Black-Bull, next Door to the Fleece-
Tavern in Cornhill. MDCCVII.

AN
Epistolary Discourse,
 Proving, from the
Scriptures and the First Fathers,
 THAT THE

S O U L
 Is a Principle Naturally Mortal:
 But Immortalized Actually: by the
 Pleasure of God to Punishment; or, to Reward
 by its Union with the Divine Baptismal Spirit.
 Wherin is Proved,
 That None have the Power of Giving this Divine
 Immortalizing Spirit, but only the Apostles, but only
BISHOPS
 With an Hypothetical Absolution.



The Second Edition, with Additions, and Corrected
 from Great Britain by the Author's own Hand.

BY **HENRY DODWELL, A.M.**

That better part of us—in and after Death does exist and
 live, either by virtue of its spiritual and immortal Nature, as
 we believe; or, at least the Will and its Power, according
 and preserving it from Dissolution, as many of the Fathers
 thought. Bishop Pearson on the Creed, Art. V. p. 235.
 23d. 5th Edit. Lond. 1683.

LONDON: Printed for A. Zamb, and sold by John
 Phillips, at the Black-Bull, next Door to the Fleet
 Tavern in Cornhill. MDCCVII.

To the Honourable

CHARLES HATTON, Esq;

I Take this Occasion, Honoured Sir, of leaving a Publick Monument of my Gratitude, for the many Favours you have shewn me ever since the time I had the Honour of being known to you. And I cannot but congratulate that exemplary Zeal for the Publick Good, which has been so conspicuous in your whole Conduct, and adds a very graceful Lustre to your honourable Extraction. But in nothing has this Publick Zeal more appeared, than in, the properest Object of Zeal, the Cause of God, and of Religion. This you have embraced, not only as a Cognizance of a Party (which too many

content themselves with) but as a Guide of your Life. And that as well in the suffering Duties of it, as those which might have recommended you to the Esteem of Men, and have increased your worldly Honour. This is indeed to lay out the Talents, with which God has intrusted you, in a way most acceptable to him, by whom you are intrusted with them. And though it hinder your worldly Progress, yet the Rewarder of your Faith will abundantly recompence you for it. It is a Title to much better Rewards, not to have received your good things here. A Title, to have been like our Saviour in his Sufferings. A Title, to have lived the Life of Faith in the midst of a backsliding unbelieving Generation. And much more rewardable where it is more rare. Nor do the worldly Benefits lost by the Discharge of a good Conscience, bear any

DEDICATION.

V

any Proportion to the Rewards of relinquishing them. No Saint in Heaven thinks his Glories dearly purchased. None is there who would not be glad to have the Opportunity of adding to his present Fruitions, by Difficulties far greater than ever exercised the Patience of the most glorious Martyr. Yet our good Lord has not so been pleased to try our Faith, as to leave us wholly to the Rewards reserved for us, when our Faith shall be turned into Fruition. The same Piety which intitles us to our future Inheritance, has the Promises of this Life also. Our Sufferings even here, have such an alloy of Supports and Fruitions, to those who resign themselves entirely to the Divine Conduct, as are sufficient, not to make them tolerable only, but desirable also, though there had been nothing further reserved for us. Such are, the Satisfaction

A 3

of

of our own Consciences, the Joys of the Heavenly Spirit, the Applause of good Men, the Reverence of even Adversaries, a fearless Concern for unavoidable Events, a confident Acquiescence in the Providence of him for whose Cause the Sufferings are undertaken, and a comfortable Expectation of that King of Terrors, who makes even the present Enjoyments of Sinners very formidable. These Considerations make the Rewards of Sufferings for Christ, in this Life, abundantly recompensed, though there had been no further recompense to be expected hereafter. So our Lord, manifold more in this Life, St. Luk. xviii. 30. An hundred fold now in this time, Houses, and Brethren, and Sisters, and Mothers, and Children, and Lands, with Persecutions, St. Mark x. 30. The Meaning is plainly this: That the Satisfaction of Mind,
even

DEDICATION.

vii

even under Losses undertaken for a good Conscience, is, even in this Life, disproportionably greater than what could have been expected from the Fruitions of the things themselves which are lost in Maintenance of a good Conscience. The worldly Wise dare not trust their Redeemer's Word for this. Nor do they qualifie themselves for knowing it experimentally. The Cross is Folly, not only to the Gentile World, but to the degenerous Professors of it in Words, whilst they do, at the same time, in their Works deny it. Yet this is the Wisdom to which you have given up your Name. This is the truest Wisdom, the Wisdom from above, which teaches you to remember your latter End, and to be wise unto Salvation. A little time will convince its present Adversaries of their own Folly in deserting it. God give them Grace

DEDICATION.

to do it while they may reap the Benefit of its Instruction, before it can serve for no other end but that of aggravating their Punishment of Loss, and the intolerable Remorse of their too late awaken'd Consciences ! I doubt not but that you will join in this charitable Office with

Shottesbrook,
Jan. 21. 170 $\frac{1}{2}$.

Your most obliged

AND

Grateful Beneficiary,

Henry Dodwell.

A P P R Æ

A
PRÆMONITION.

THAT the *Reader* may the better *The Frag-*
understand the following *Discourse*, *ments of*
I thought it requisite to transcribe *the Let-*
the Passages here alluded to, out of the *ters which*
ters that *occasioned* it. They were in all *two; the follow-*
and both of them from an excellent Person, *ing Dis-*
but as yet unknown to me. *course.*

In the *former* he has these Words :

‘ In the first place, I own that to derive
‘ the Immortality and spiritual Nature of
‘ the Soul, together with that Angelical
‘ Perfection and Happiness (for which the
‘ Members of the Church stand Candi-
‘ dates in this Life, to which they have an
‘ unquestionable Title in this Life, and of
‘ which they shall be possess’d in the other
‘ World) from an Interest in the Covenant
‘ with God, doth greatly enhance the va-
‘ lue of the Covenant. It renders it
‘ which was made with *Adam*, renew’d
‘ with *Seth*, and retriev’d by Jesus Christ,
‘ most

A PRÆMONITION.

' most Illustrious, most Worthy of God,
 ' of his Son, of the Holy Trinity, most
 ' Honourable, most Comfortable to Man.
 ' The *Jewish* Church, with all its Types,
 ' Prophecies, Figures, &c. is ennobled by
 ' being a shadow of the Christian Church,
 ' which, by the inseparable Connexion
 ' with that in Heaven, is none other than
 ' a Polity of Angelick Men, undergoing a
 ' short Discipline here on Earth, under the
 ' Regiment and Tuition of God and his
 ' Son, with, and to, whom they are uni-
 ' ted by the Holy Ghost. Besides, if the
 ' Immortality of the Soul derives only
 ' and meerly from the Covenant; I think
 ' the perplexing Difficulties about the Im-
 ' putation of Original Sin, the Traducti-
 ' on of the Soul, &c. will evanish. God
 ' will be justified in all his Proceedings
 ' with Men since the Fall of *Adam*, because
 ' the innumerable Millions of Men, who
 ' sprung out of his Loins, are not damn'd,
 ' (as is vulgarly believ'd) but only de-
 ' priv'd of a Privilege which was the effect
 ' of his Covenanting with Men, and which
 ' Covenant was the effect of pure Grace.
 ' From this Hypothesis also the Grace of
 ' God, through Jesus Christ, doth shine
 ' forth most gloriously. Inasmuch as that
 ' after the breach of the Covenant once
 ' and again, he yet should have renew'd
 ' it with *Abraham* and his Seed, and after-
 ' wards

wards have sent his Son into our Nature,
and to this lower World to invite all
Men into it. Moreover this Hypothe-
sis may, in a great measure, serve to
clear up the perplex'd Disputes about
God's Decrees, wherewith the Church
hath been often and much vex'd. It
serves to these and many other good
Purposes. [Those words relate to what
I had said in my Discourse concerning *Mar-
riages* out of the *Peculium*, and in my
second *Letter of Advice for Theological
Studies*.]

Afterwards he goes on thus : ' But
then it hath against it all the Arguments
which Christian Philosophers have ad-
vanced in the Pneumaticks against the
Atheists and Deists. It ascribes to Mat-
ter the most stupid of things the Divine
and Spiritual Qualities of Thought and
Reflection, of Liberty and Consciousness,
and will force us to ascribe all the Con-
templations, Sagacity, Science, yea and
Virtues of all who are not within a true
Episcopal Communion, to the force of
meer Mechanism. For I can conceive of no
created thing, at least, but of Spirit, Mat-
ter and Motion. Yet this should be no
hindrance to my Assent (though it be
full as unintelligible as Transubstantia-
tion) if God had told us of it in his
Word, That none. but such as are with-
in

' in the Christian Covenant, have a Prin-
 ' ciple of Immortality. The wise Man,
 ' *Eccl.* iii. 21. ascribeth the Spirit to Man
 ' as such. It is confess'd, that *Abraham*,
 ' and the Inspired Men under the Law are
 ' Immortal, because the Spirit by whom
 ' they were inspired, made them such.
 ' And if these extraordinary Influences of
 ' the Spirit convey'd such a Virtue unto a
 ' thing otherwise mortal, what shall we
 ' say of the Waters on which the Spirit
 ' mov'd? What of *Balaam's* Ass? May it
 ' not be thought, that as much stress may
 ' be laid on one of our Saviour's Parables
 ' as on any thing in all the Heathen My-
 ' thology? And it's obvious that *Dives*,
 ' whom we may presume not to have
 ' been an inspired Person, is supposed to
 ' exist, and that in no good condition,
 ' after Death. And indeed that Parable
 ' will amount to nothing, unless it prove
 ' the Happiness of a good, and the Misery
 ' of even a bad, *Jew* after Death. The
 ' New Testament seems to threaten the Pu-
 ' nishment of the other World to an obsti-
 ' nate *Jew*. 'Tis true that some learn'd
 ' Interpreters make the weeping and gnash-
 ' ing of Teeth, *Matth.* viii. 12. and the
 ' everlasting Destruction and flaming Fire,
 ' 2 *Thes.* i. 8, 9. to mean no other thing
 ' but Temporal Calamity. Particularly,
 ' that which was inflicted on the *Jews* at
 ' the

‘ the Destruction of their Temple and Ci-
‘ ty. But this weeping and gnashing of
‘ Teeth is opposed to the sitting down with
‘ *Abraham, &c.* in the Kingdom of Hea-
‘ ven. And therefore should, by the
‘ Rules of good Logick, mean some other
‘ thing than Temporal Calamities. In the
‘ other place, the unquenchable Fire is
‘ denounc’d against those who obey not the
‘ Truth, who are the very same *Jews* who
‘ troubled the Christian *Thessalonians*, v. 6.
‘ And those may have as truly been the
‘ persecuting *Jews* as the Christian *Gnosticks*.
‘ And, if so, then the *extra-peculium Jews* are
‘ awarded to everlasting Destruction; and
‘ consequently are to be reckon’d Immor-
‘ tal. And if these unquenchable Flames,
‘ and everlasting Destruction denote not
‘ the Punishments of the future State, why
‘ should these and the like Expressions sig-
‘ nify it in other places? May not the E-
‘ nemies of Religion clap such a figurative
‘ Gloss on all those places which signify
‘ the Punishments of Hell? Our Lord is
‘ stiled a Redeemer, a Saviour. And it
‘ would seem that these Legal Names
‘ had a reference to Legal Sentences
‘ past against Man. Now if our natu-
‘ ral Death results from our natural Con-
‘ stitution (which it must do upon this
‘ Principle) Jesus Christ cannot be called
‘ our Redeemer, in a strict and proper
‘ Sense,

A PRÆMONITION.

‘ Sense, by vouchsafing the Resurrection of
 ‘ our Body. And, in no Sense, can he be
 ‘ called Jesus, or the Saviour of Men (those
 ‘ of the *Ségullah* excepted) with respect to
 ‘ Hell. Because none, save the Members
 ‘ of the Church are supposed capable of
 ‘ any such Punishment. With respect to
 ‘ Mankind in general, he may properly
 ‘ be called a Benefactor. But I do not see
 ‘ how the Name of Redeemer or Saviour
 ‘ can be attributed to him. And yet the
 ‘ Apostle stiles him the Saviour of all
 ‘ Men, especially of such as believe. And
 ‘ *Rev.* xxi. 8. the Unbelievers and Idolaters
 ‘ are doom’d to Brimstone, &c. which is
 ‘ called the second Death, which one
 ‘ would think were no Apostates, but such
 ‘ as never had been within the Church.
 ‘ And *Mark* xvi. 16. As they who believ’d
 ‘ and were baptiz’d were sav’d, so they
 ‘ who did not believe were damned. Does
 ‘ Damnation here mean no other thing
 ‘ but a meer Privation of a glorious Im-
 ‘ mortality? And, if it signifies any thing
 ‘ else, this Hypothesis falls to the Ground.
 ‘ If it means no other thing, then the De-
 ‘ spisers and virulent Opposers of the Go-
 ‘ spel will be in no worse Case than an
 ‘ *American* who never heard of it. The
 ‘ great Judgment is represented as Univer-
 ‘ sal, and not confin’d to those within the
 ‘ Covenant. To be sure *St. Paul* must
 ‘ have

‘ have reason’d so with *Felix* and the *A-*
‘ *thenians*. For how could the first have
‘ trembled, unless he had suppos’d himself
‘ comprehended? Or how could the Apo-
‘ stle’s Argument have been conclusive, had
‘ he suppos’d them, whilst out of the *Pe-*
‘ *culium*, to be meer Mortals? If this
‘ Principle be true, the Apostle could not,
‘ indeed no Man can, fairly persuade any
‘ Man to become a Member of the Church,
‘ from any Motive of Fear of future Pu-
‘ nishments. And yet it has been the
‘ most powerful in effecting a Change,
‘ more forcible than that of future Re-
‘ wards. If the Laws of the Land did not
‘ punish such as keep back their Children
‘ from Baptism, the Hopes of future Re-
‘ wards (when their not being entred in-
‘ to the *Peculium* secures them from the
‘ Fears of everlasting Misery) would not
‘ prevail with many of them.

‘ I do not comprehend what is laid down
‘ in that Book about the Divine Seed. It
‘ is represented sometimes as a vital Prin-
‘ ciple; and other while as a Subsistence
‘ distinct from the Rational Soul; and
‘ then, as if it were the Holy Ghost him-
‘ self. Care should be taken in expressing
‘ such matters, that the weak be not scan-
‘ daliz’d. Now, whatever be the man-
‘ ner of the Holy Ghost’s Inhabitation,
‘ yet it’s certain that, so long as we are in
‘ the

A PRÆMONITION.

‘ the Body, we want repeated Assistances
 ‘ of the Holy Spirit, which is evident
 ‘ from every good Man’s Experience. And,
 ‘ unless this be granted, Prayer for Increase
 ‘ of Grace is to no purpose.

‘ Your charitable Assistance, to help me
 ‘ through such Difficulties, is earnestly de-
 ‘ sired.

In the second Letter he writes thus :

D. B.

‘ Allow me to beg your Assistance in a
 ‘ matter which not only nearly concerneth
 ‘ me, but also this poor afflicted Church
 ‘ and Clergy. It is evident that this vast
 ‘ Defection from the Communion Episco-
 ‘ pal is, in a great part, owing to our Ig-
 ‘ norance of the true Notions both of a
 ‘ Church and Clergy. To rectify this po-
 ‘ pular and dangerous Error, some late Wri-
 ‘ tings had contributed, and many were
 ‘ coming over to the Communion of the
 ‘ Church, and consequently in the road
 ‘ of becoming serious Christians. But
 ‘ these our Hopes are very much damp’d
 ‘ by the opposition that is made by the
 ‘ *Bourignonists*, who make light of Order
 ‘ Civil and Ecclesiastical. They bear it
 ‘ high, at St. *Andrew’s* especially. And
 ‘ the rather, because the Students were
 ‘ like to come over to Church-Principals.
 ‘ They

‘ They boast as if *Poirot* had worsted
‘ Mr. *Dodwell*. I know not of any such
‘ thing done by Mr. *Poirot*. Yet this ve-
‘ ry Boast staggers unsettled Youth. It
‘ were therefore worth the while to vin-
‘ dicate the Church against the Cavils of
‘ those Enthusiasts, who are likely in a
‘ short time to prove more dangerous than
‘ the Presbyterians, the last not being so
‘ much supported by the Populace as by
‘ the secular Arm.

‘ Mr. *Dodwell*, in a Book upon Marria-
‘ ges, makes the Immortality of the Soul
‘ to be the effect of the Divine Spirit,
‘ which he restrains to them within the
‘ Covenant, and by consequence all with-
‘ out the Christian Covenant (ordinarily)
‘ have no Principle of Immortality. This
‘ Assertion hath done much harm, it be-
‘ ing considered as a Notion advanced
‘ both against the Catholick Principles of
‘ the Soul’s Immortality, and Antiscriptu-
‘ ral. We are put hard to it in his De-
‘ fence. For it is told us, that the Chil-
‘ dren of the Kingdom, *Matth. viii. 12.*
‘ were the *Jews*, to whom Mr. *Dodwell*
‘ allows no more than a Title to the Spi-
‘ rit in reversion (except to such of them
‘ as were inspired) and yet they are said
‘ to be cast into outer Darkness, which
‘ even he confesses to signify the Punish-
‘ ment of the after State. We are told
‘ a that

' that the Day which is appointed for
 ' judging the World in Righteousness,
 ' *Act. xviii. 31.* is the Day of Judgment.
 ' And, if so, those, with whom the A-
 ' postle disputed, were to be judged.
 ' And if they were to be judged, they
 ' had a Principle of Immortality, even
 ' though without the Covenant. The
 ' Scripture tells us, that it's appointed
 ' for all Men once to dye, and after that
 ' the Judgment. And thence they infer
 ' that the Judgment must be *æquè latè*
 ' *patens* as the Death. The Judgment
 ' threatned against *Chorazin* and *Bethsaida*,
 ' is said to be more intolerable than that
 ' of *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*. And I do not
 ' think that the Calamity of *Judæa*, when
 ' that Nation and Polity was destroy'd,
 ' came up to that of *Sodom*. One would
 ' think that the resisting of the Holy Ghost,
 ' at the rate the *Jews* did, was a Sin much
 ' more heinous than a wilful unrepented
 ' Immorality committed by a Christian,
 ' and that therefore the Righteous Judge
 ' of the World would not damn the lat-
 ' ter to endless exquisite Torments, when
 ' the other suffers no more than a tempo-
 ' ral and bodily Punishment, &c.

April xxiv. 1705.

By

A PRÆMONITION.

xix

By these things the *Reader* will easily perceive how much this worthy Gentleman is *mistaken*, when, from the *Doctrine* of the *natural Mortality* of *Humane Souls*, he infers the *actual Mortality* of all that are out of the *Peculium* by their own fault; or indeed of any one *single Person*, who is concerned in *this Case*. That neither is my *Opinion*, nor is any just *Consequence* of my *Principles*; as he will easily find when he has been pleased to consider my *Thoughts* delivered in the following *Discourse*. I do not think that any *adult Person* whatsoever, living where *Christianity* is *professed*, and the *Motives* of its *Credibility* are sufficiently *proposed*, can hope for the *Benefit* of *Actual Mortality*. On the contrary, I have proved all such *Unbelievers* liable to the *Condemnatory Sentence* of the *General Judgment*. I am therefore no more concerned for the *Gentleman's Arguments* of this kind, than *himself*. He is again mistaken, when he reckons all *Inspired Persons* in the *Old Testament* as endued *actually* with the *Principle* of *Immortality*. That is perfectly *against* the *Revelations* of the *New Testament*, and of the *Old Testament* also, which relate to the *Times* of the *New Testament*. I must not now repeat what I have produced to this purpose in this *Discourse* it self. The *Spirit's moving on the Face of the Waters* will

2.
The Gentleman mistakes my Hypothesis, when he takes it to suppose the actual Mortality of all who are out of the Peculium.

no more make the *Waters immortal*, than his *Omnipresence* as *GOD* will make *all* things so. If it would, there would be *nothing* mortal and corruptible, because *nothing* can *subsist* without the all-sustaining *Spirit*. Which if it had, it must be *immortal*, if its *presence*, in *any sense*, had been *alone* sufficient for *Immortality*. But I need not here repeat what I have said in the following Discourse, for proving, that the *Immortalizing* Presence of the *Spirit* is, in the current of the *New Testament*, supposed *not* to have been given to any, since the *loss* of it by the Fall of Mankind, till the *Resurrection* of our *Lord*, who had the *disposal* of it, as being inhabited, with the *fulness* of the *Spirit*; of which *fulness*, all others are to *receive* their several Proportions respectively, *S. Joh. i. 16*. This is the *Scripture-account* of that *Immortality*, which may only seem to *deserve* the Name of *Immortality*; that is, of the *Immortality* of *Happiness*.

3. *Perpetual Punishment*, in the *Scripture* Phrase, is rather reckoned as a *Death*, than a *Life*. That is the *second*, and most *afflictive* Death. And therefore the *prolonging* of the duration is not taken for a *Life*, nor a *Favour*. Nor is it accordingly ascribed to the *Divine Spirit*, which is the Original of the *Diviner Life*, and of the Pleasure of God, than to the Divine Spirit.

those

those *præternatural* Favours, which are called *Grace*, and are all derived from that same *Spirit*. The *Original* therefore of that *Immortality*, if it may be so called, may be more agreeably derived from the *Divine Pleasure*, than from the *nature* of *Soul* which is thus to be *immortalized*. So *Plato* accounts for it. And so *S. Justin Martyr*, who lived *nearest* to the *Age* of the *Apostles*, in his words here produced. And it serves alike for the *end* and *terror* of such a *Punishment*, that the *Soul* be *actually* perpetuated; whether that *Perpetuity* be ascribed to the *nature* of the *Soul* itself, or whether *God* be *pleased* to *continue* the duration of it beyond the exigency or power of its own *nature*. Provided that timely *warning* may be given to all that are concerned in it, and the *Consequences* of it, by *Divine Revelation*; which is the only *Rational* Means for *notifying* the *Divine Pleasure*, in *Facts* entirely depending on the *Divine Pleasure*. And that *Revelation* will then be more *credible*, when it is *agreeable* to the *Nature* concerned in it, which is *naturally inclined* to *believe* it; as being at *first* ennobled with a *Divine Original*, and *designed* by *God* as a *Candidate* for *Immortality*, as a *Reward* of the good *Use* of his own *Free Will*. This the *Soul* has from the *νοῦς* and *Flatus*, distinct from the *πνεῦμα* or *Spirit* given

in *Baptism* to *Favourites* only, of the *true Peculium*. This intitles it to be, in some sense, a *Divine Offspring* in a *higher* sense, than the *Souls* of any other *Sublunary Animals*. Yet it will not necessarily make them *naturally Immortal*, any more than those many other *Creatures* made immediately by *God*, without any *design* of *qualifying* them for even a *præternatural Immortality*. Yet it may *recommend* them to a *Divine Concern* for them more than for those other *Creatures* which *never* had the *Honour* done them, that might any way *intitle* them to that *Care of God* for them, which becomes a *Parent* to his own *Offspring*. And as *God* has thus admitted them to *præternatural Felicities*, as *Rewards* of their *Duty* to him; so he may oblige them to make a *prudent choice*, of what is otherwise their own *Interest*, by threatening *Punishments* of a like nature, *præternatural* and *perpetual*, if their *Interest* cannot alone prevail on them to make that *Choice*. And, having *threatned* them, his *Veracity*, as well as his *Justice*, will oblige him to *perform* his *Threats*, as well as his *Promises*. And all this may be the *Effect* of a *Paternal Good-will*, when it is done with a *design* of *Kindness* to every *Individual Subject* of his *Government*, as well as that of *securing* the *Body* itself, and the good *Government* of it (which is also the

Interest

Interest of all Particulars) against the mischief that might follow from the undisciplined Use of extravagant Free Wills. On these Terms he may continue their duration, to qualify them for more lasting Punishments, who would not otherwise qualify themselves for the more lasting præternatural Rewards which he had designed for them.

God did indeed raise up Pharaoh for an example, and is said to have made the Wicked for the day of Evil. So the Old Testament represents the Case in regard of exemplary temporal Punishments, which were the only Punishments then known, either by Reasonings, or even the Divine Revelations of that Time. But God was so far from predestinating Men to Eternal Punishments, that the Revelations of even the New Testament itself represent those Punishments as not prepared for Men, but only for the Devil and his Angels. If therefore those Angels, who were naturally immortal, had not fallen, there had been no Hell at all. And Mankind is no otherwise concerned in it, by this Scripture-account of it, than as, by joining themselves to the Devil's Party, they intitle themselves to those Punishments which were prepared for the Devil and his Associates. No, nor even by being subject to the Devil, on account of their being within that Jurisdiction which had been, by Providence,

4.
The Souls that are common to all Men, do not so depend on our gross organical Bodies, as that they must necessarily perish on their dissolution from their Bodies.

allotted to him *before his fall*, and which was still *allowed him after his expulsion from Heaven*. But under such *restrictions* of his *Malignancy*, as the *Divine Goodness* was pleased to *lay upon him*, for the *good of the Sublunary Creatures*. The *effect* of their *fall into this subcælestial district* had only been, that they would have been liable to the *vanity, the corruption, the mortality*, of the *place to which their fall had reduced them*, in the *region of darkness and shadow of death*; the *power of which the Scripture still assigns to the Devil*. The consequence therefore of his *Fall alone*, was so far from making *Men* liable to *Eternal Punishments*, that it made them *incapable of them*, by *reducing them to that finite duration* which was *natural to them*, and which could not be avoided but by an *accession* of that nobler *præternatural Principle*, with which *God* was pleased to favour *Man* above all other *Corporeal Beings*; that of the *Divine πνεῦμα* or *Flatus*, as *contradistinct* from the more properly *Divine πνεῦμα*, or *Spirit*. This made a difference between *Men* and the *Beasts that perish*: That the *Spirit of the Beasts went downwards*, as *falling on the Earth*, signifies *perishing in the Stile of the Holy Scriptures*; but the *Spirit of Man went upwards*, returning to the *Lord that gave it*, that is, into the *Air*, the *Ἄδης of Humane Souls*. This plainly supposes it

not

not to depend on our gross Organical Bodies,
 nor therefore to *perish* upon its *dissolution*
 from *those Bodies*. And the same is suppo-
 sed when our *Souls* are said to depend on
 the *Pleasure* of the *God* that first *breathed*
 them into us, as the *Fathers* here mention-
 ed, say they do. The meaning of that
 Expression cannot be, that it is in his Power
 and Pleasure to *annihilate* them when he
 thinks fit. That is not *peculiar* to our
Souls, but *common* to them with *all* created
 Beings whatsoever, even *Angels*, and the
most perfect Creatures, however pretending
 to an *Immortality* of their own *Nature*. The
 meaning therefore must be, that they do
 not so depend on any *other created Being*,
 but that they may *still* continue in their
 duration, whatsoever other *created* Influ-
 ences be *withdrawn* from them, if *God* be
 pleased *still* to continue that *Ordinary Pro-*
vidence which is essentially *necessary* for
 their *continuance*, who can no more *conti-*
nue than *give* their own *Being*. Withal, as
 it is a *Flatus*, it implies a more *immediate*
Dependence on *God*, as the *Breather* of it,
 than *other* Creatures, which must make it
cease to be, whenever he is pleased to *cease*
 to *breath* it, as being *unable* to *continue* its
 own Duration by the *Powers* given it at its
 first *Production*, and the *continuance* of those
 general Influences which are requisite for the
 support of *Created Beings* in general. This
 makes

makes its *Immortality* perfectly *Arbitrary*. And by this *God* put it in the Power of *Adam* to have *immortalized* himself by his *Obedience*, Not that the *Flatus* was it self *Immortal*, though independent on its *Organical Body*; but because that alone would have enabled him to have *laid hold* on the *Diviner Spirit*, a *Union* with which would have actually *immortalized* him. However its *independency* on the *Body* is sufficient to overthrow the modern *Paradox* of the *ψυχοπαύχια* confuted by *Calvin* in the *Anabaptists*, though now lately revived in our own Age, so unhappy for *Innovating Paradoxes*. These pretend the *Soul* to *die* actually with the *Body*, and to *rise* again with it at the general *Resurrection*. But this very Opinion was confuted by *Origen*, and the *Synod*, which seconded him, in the *Arabians* of that Age. So far it was from the sense of the *Primitive Christians*, for which I am here concerned. I mention rather the sense of the *Church* then being, than that of *Origen*, that none may think this Censure imputable to any *singular Opinion* of *Origen*. The *Synod* convened on that Occasion, shews plainly, that they did not look on that *Doctrine* as disputable, or of *little Importance*, but as *contrary* to those *Traditions* wherein the *Catholick Church* was then agreed.

Euſ. H. E.
vi. 37.

But

But the *perpetuating* of a *Nature* which was not of it *self* perpetual, and the perpetuating it with this very *Design* that they who had *not* of themselves a *Perpetuity* of *Being*, might notwithstanding be made capable of a *Perpetuity* of *Punishment*, is so great a *hardship* on the *Creature*, as that *God* did not think it becoming him to inflict it *arbitrarily*, nor agreeable to his other *Attributes* of *Goodness* and *Mercy*. He therefore took care not to do it but for a *Crime* of a *high* *Nature*, nor till they, who were concerned, had been fairly warned of the *Crime* by a sufficient *Promulgation* of his *Pleasure* concerning it. The *Judge* of *all the Earth* could do no otherwise than *Right*, as *Abraham* pleads with him; and *Right* according to those very *Opinions* which *himself* had settled among *Men* for their *good Government*, that he might be *justified* in his *Saying*, and *clear* whenever his *Case* should be *judged* by any *equal Ex-postulation*. This required that the *Criminals* should be left *destitute* of any *just Apology* for themselves, as the *Apostle* reasons. But it is allowed as an *equal Plea* in all *just Judicatories*, if the *Crime* charged were not in the *Power* of the *Criminal*, or if he had no antecedent *warning* for *avoiding* it. Accordingly he took care that *neither* of these *Pleas* should be *truly* *allegeable* by those whose *duration* should be *perpetuated* for

5.

This perpetuating of Human Nature for Punishment could not be justly inflicted, till a Publication of God's pleasure that he judged the Devil a Publick Enemy; and that all who did not joyn the Body instituted by himself, should be taken for Associates of the Devil, and punished accordingly.

for this *end*, that they might thereby be made capable of *Punishments* otherwise *exceeding* the *natural* Powers of their *degree* of *Being*. The *Devil* himself was a *Subject*, and enjoyed a *subordinate* Power under his *Creator*, and whatever *Jurisdiction* he had, he could have no *otherwise* but by the *Grant* of *God* himself. And therefore *Communication* with *him* could be no otherwise *culpable* than as it is accounted with *ill affected* Subjects, before their *Hostilities* are *notorious* in *themselves*, or *notified* by publick *Proclamations*. Then, and not *till* then, *joyning* with *them* becomes *Criminal*, and renders the Persons *joyning* with them, guilty of the same *Rebellion*, and liable to the same *Punishment* with the *principal* *Rebels*. Thus therefore *joyning* with the *Devil*, after he was a *proclaimed* *Rebel*, made those who did so of his *Party*, and, by becoming so, liable to the *Punishment* prepared for the *Devil* and his *Associates*, from that time forward, though it was not so *before*. Till such a publick *Notification* it is no more *Treasonable* to maintain a *civil* Conversation with *Traitors* than with other *Subjects*. And the *subordinate* Power allowed the *Devil* by *God*, supposed *him* also a *Subject*, and a *Member* of that great *Society* of which *God* is the *Head*, as well as the good *Angels*. This *Proclamation* therefore of the *Devil* as a *publick* *Enemy*, is peculiarly the
Office

Office of the *Gospel*: Especially as relating to the Affairs of *Souls*. Nor can any such thing be pretended, that I know of, from any Passages of the *Old Testament*, but only such as relate to the State of the *Gospel*. But it is the main Office of the *Gospel* itself, to *proclaim* the Devil a *Publick Enemy* to the *Kingdom of Heaven* preached by it, to denounce *War* against him, and to oblige all true *Subjects* of that *Kingdom* to joyn in the *War* against him, and to forbear, from thence forward, all *Communication* with him, under pain of *sharing* in his *Punishment*. That is, in that *lower Hell*, which was not *originally* designed for *Men*, but for him, and such as should willingly *partake* in his *Rebellion*. Under this Dispensation it is that our Blessed Lord has set up his *Standard*, his *στανδάρτον*, as the Prophet *Isaiah* calls it, like the *Arrier Bands*, still in use in several Countries, in Case of extreme *danger*, summoning every *Individual Subject* to repair to it, and threatening to treat them as *Enemies* themselves if afterwards they countenance the *Hostile Body* against which the *War* is proclaimed. This leaves no place for *Neutrality*, reckoning those as *Enemies* who do not list themselves in the *Prince's Service*, though they should not *openly* list themselves with his *Adversaries*, and making them liable to the *Punishment* intended for professed *Enemies*.

A PRÆMONITION.

Enemies. Which is the very Case described in the Scriptures, of allotting them to the *Tartarean Fire* prepare for the *Devil and his Angels*. Nor does our *Saviour* allow of any *Neutrality*. So he warns us very plainly that *he also will judge in our present Case. He that is not with me, is against me: and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth.* S. Matth. xii. 30. S. Luk. xi. 23. And all the Solemnities of *initiating* us into this *Spiritual Warfare* are proper to the *Gospel*. The *Cross of Christ* is indeed the *Military Standard* prophesied in the Old Testament concerning our *new Dispensation* in the *latter days* wherein we live. And so it was understood by our *Christian Ancestors*. The *New Testament* calls our Profession a *σπαρέα*, and makes our *Warfare* against *Spiritual Wickednesses in Heavenly Places*, and ascribes their *Ejection* out of *Heaven* to the good Success of this *War* against them. And the *Shield of Faith* is to quench the *fiery darts* of the *Devil*. And the *Triumph* over the *Devil* and his *Party* is in the *Cross*. So in our *Ecclesiastical Rites of Initiation*, our *Military Symbol or Word* (to use the Phrase of our modern *Tactics*) is the *Creed*; our *Military Oath* is in our *Christian Sacraments*; the *Forms* of *συντάσσεν τῷ χριστῷ* and *ἀποτάσσεν τὸ σατανᾶ*, are also plainly *Military*, and our *Renunciations* are expressly against the *Devil*; and of the
World

A PRÆMONITION.

xxxii

World, and the Flesh no otherwise than as they help the Devil to Objects and Dispositions, and seasonable Opportunities for ensnaring us. He therefore alone is the Lord and Tyrant of those unhappy Souls which lose their Liberty by being conquered, and, by the Right of War, become his Slaves. All these things are properly New Testament Revelations, and therefore cannot affect those, who never heard of those Revelations, so as to involve them in Punishments disproportionate to their Nature, and which were not originally designed for Men at all, but Devils: nor for Men even now any otherwise then as by not joyning Christ, he himself has declared that he will so interpret it as if they had joyned themselves to the Devil. Thus they are supposed to entitle themselves to the Punishment of the Devils, by making their Cause the same with that of the Devils. Yet even these things also, which, in this way of Reasoning, make wicked Men liable to these Eternal Punishments are not Revelations of the Old Testament, but of the New. It is our Blessed Lord that has assured us, that the Prince of this World is judged, S. Job. xvi. 11. It is S. Jude that teaches us, That the Angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, are reserved in everlasting Chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day, v. 6. It is S. Peter, from whom

whom we learn, that *God* has *delivered* them *into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto Judgment*, 2 *Ep.* ii. 4. The *Book of Enoch* indeed shews some received *Opinions* concerning these things, even in the *Apostolical Age*. But in vain shall we expect any distinct account from the *Old Testament*, of the *Punishment* of *fallen Angels* where there is so little mention of their *Fall*. Their *Fall* is indeed *supposed*, and, perhaps, *alluded* to in some *Prophecies* of the *Old Testament*, But no *particular* of this *Sentence* against them, nothing of their being *chained*, and that in *Chains of Darkness*. Nothing of their being *reserved* for *Judgment*, or of the *day appointed for their Judgment*. These were indeed *Conjectures* taken up by the *Hellenists*, perhaps from some *footsteps* of *Primitive Tradition*. But they never had the *Authority of Divine Revelation* (which was that *alone* that could *assure* us of *Facts* of *this Nature*) till the times of the *New Testament*. These are they *alone* which assure us, that they are *then* designed for that *lower* *Adns*, which was known among the *Heathens* by the name of *Tartarus*. How then could *Men* be *warned* that they should be reckoned as of the *Devil's Party*, whilst the *Devil* was not yet *declared* as the *Head* of a *Party*? How could they be *threatned* with the *Punishment*, which did no otherwise belong to *them* than as they were

A PRÆMONITION. xxxiii

were of *that Party*, whilst there were yet no clear and distinct *Revelations* concerning the *nature* of those *Punishments* which were impossible to be *known* otherwise than by *Divine Revelation*? If this Title of *Men*, to *Preternatural* and *Eternal Punishments* must commence from the *time* wherein the *Devil* was *proclaimed* a *publick Enemy*: This Supposition puts it in the *Arbitrary Power of God* when they should *commence*, because it was perfectly *Arbitrary* to him, when he would be pleased to *notifie* his Pleasure in this matter, and to *proclaim* the *Devil* a *publick Enemy*. And their being *Arbitrary* will make them most agreeable to the *nature* of the *Rewards*, by which our *new Legislation* receives its *Sanction*, which being *Preternatural* and *Supernatural*, can be no other than *Arbitrary*. If therefore this *notification* began with the *Gospel*, the *Punishment* must begin so too. Yet the Hypothesis of *Preaching* and *Baptizing* in *Adms*, as an *Ordinary Means* for saving them who lived *before* the *Publication* of the *Gospel*, will easily make them liable to the same *Punishment* at the *last Day*, who never heard of the *Gospel*, whilst they were in their *Bodies*, if *God* be *pleased* to make them *concerned* in it.

6. But I did not derive this *Publication* of *God's Pleasure* in this matter *high* enough, when I traced no *earlier* Footsteps of it, than from the time of *St. Paul's* Sermon to the *Athenians*. I now take the true *Original Promulgation* of this *new Law*, to have been from those *Words* of our *Saviour*, enjoining the Promulgation of his Gospel: *Go ye into all the World, and preach the Gospel to every Creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not, shall be damned.* So *St. Mark* xvi. 15, 16. who is so far from being an *Epitomator* of *St. Matthew* (as some conceive him) that he is *fuller* than *St. Matthew* himself, or any other of the *Evangelists*, at least in this particular. The Word is *κατακευθίσαι*. That Word properly signifies the *condemnatory Sentence* given in a *κρίσις*, which indifferently denotes a Sentence of *Absolution*, as well as of *Condemnation*, *Rom. ii. 1.* This is the *κρίσις* of the *κόσμος*, *1 Cor. xi. 32.* As the *World* signifies the *opposite Body* to that of *Christ*, that is, that *Body* of which the *Devil* is the *Head*, and the *God*, and the *Prince*, in the *Stile* of the *New Testament*. It is the same with the *κρίμα* elsewhere, which also generally signifies the *worst* Sense. It is stiled *κρίμα αἰώνιον*, *Ebr. vi. 2.* And *κρίμα τὸ Διαβόλεον*, *1 Tim. iii. 6.* to shew that it is a Sentence to an *Eternal Punishment*.

like that which was passed on the *Devil*, to which *wicked Men* make themselves obnoxious, by their *not* siding with our common *Lord*, when required to do so. So *Tatian* explains it, that it is their *Society* with the *Devils* that makes them liable to the *Punishment* of *Devils*. Κρίσις also, tho' otherwise (as I said) of a *middle* Signification, yet, in the *New Testament*, it is almost appropriated to the *harsher* Sense. So coming εἰς κρίσιν is opposed to *having Everlasting Life*, which is taken for the same as *passing from Death to Life*, St. *John* v. 24. Κρίσις thus understood, must be the same with the κατὰ κρίσιν denounced by our *Saviour* against the *Unbelievers* of the *Gospel*. This therefore can be no other but the κρίσις τῆς Διαβολῆς mentioned by the Apostolical *Ignatius*, in his famous *Epistle* to the *Romans*. That *Punishment* which is to be inflicted on the *Devil* by the Λόγος, the κριτὴς in the ἡμεῖς κρίσις designed for the *Devil*, according to the Opinion of the *Hellenists*, confirmed by the *Revelations* of the *New Testament*. That very κρίσις which is opposed by the *Apostle* to a simple ἀπώλεια, *Rom.* ii. 12. and which is there ascribed to a νόμος, like that by which we are all sentenced to *Death* in *Adam*. And thus it appears, that they are *reckoned* as of the *Devils Party*, who are to be punished by that very *Punishment* which was originally

nally *designed* for none but *Devils*. Yet this *ἁγίαις* belongs to all that *do not receive the Gospel*, when it is sufficiently proposed to them. So the Evangelist; *Ἐν δὲ ἔσω ἡ ἁγίαις*, that *Light is come into the World, and Men loved Darkness rather than Light, because their Deeds were Evil*, St. John iii. 19. By *disbelieving the Gospel*, they *disown the Society of Christ*, who is by him said to be the *Light that enlightheth every one that cometh into the World*. And by *continuing in their Original Darkness* when they might have *Light*, they are interpreted to *love that Darkness rather than the Light* refused by them, and consequently to *chuse his Party*, who is the *Prince of Darkness*. And this is said to be the cause that makes them liable to this *ἁγίαις*, which belongs to them as the *Associates of the Devil*, that they *do not receive the Gospel* when sufficiently proposed to them. This is the Meaning of the *Opposition* between *Light* and *Darkness* in the *first Catholick Epistle of St. John*, and of the *ways of Light and Darkness* in the *Catholick Epistle of St. Barnabas*. They thereby shew, that the *Gospel*, since its *Publication*, admits of no *Neutrality*; but that whoever does *not embrace the Gospel*, shall, for that Reason, be *judged to chuse the Party of the Prince of Darkness*; and shall therefore be adjudged to that *outer Tartarean Darkness* where he is *chained*, and partake of

A PRÆMONITION. xxxvii

of that *Judgment* of the *great Day*, for which he is *reserved* in those *Chains*. This therefore is the *Meaning* of the *Damnation* denounced by our *Saviour* against *Disbelievers* of his *Gospel*. And this *Authority* *St. Paul* had for letting the *Athenians* know the *Terms* on which they were *obliged* to receive the *Gospel*. And this was the *Rule* for all the *other Apostles* also in their *Preachings*, to *oblige* their *Auditors* to receive their *Doctrine*, and to *enter* into their *Communion*. They never allow any *middle State* in their *Auditors* between *Light* and *Darkness*, between *Christ* and *Belial*, between the *Table* of the *Lord*, and the *Table* of *Devils*; between *Everlasting Salvation*, and the *Everlasting Damnation* to the *Fire* prepared for the *Devil* and his *Angels*. And they always reckon them in the *State* of *preternatural Misery*, till they might be prevailed on to *qualifie* themselves for *Supernatural Happiness*, by *joining* in *External Communion* with *themselves*, as being alone *authorized* to receive them to the *Mystical* and *Invisible Communion* with the *Father* and the *Son*.

Here therefore began this *Obligation*, as it concerned *all Men*, and *every where*, as the *Apostle* expresses it, in his *Sermon* to the *Athenians*; that is, as it concerned *all Nations*, as well as that of the *Jews*, and *all Countries* as well as *Palestine*. This

7.
It is supposed in the Preaching of our Bl. Saviour, and of S. John the Baptist.

xxxviii A PRÆMONITION.

Extent of it *began* from this *Command* of our *Saviour* to his *Apostles*, immediately before his *Departure* from them. At least from the *time* that they were *convinced* of the *Right* of other *Nations* to be *received* into the *new Peculium*; and of their own *Duty* to *Preach* to them, and to *invite* and *receive* them into their *privileged Body*. Yet, even *before* all *Nations* were thought concerned in it, they who *heard* of the *Gospel*, either from our *Saviour* himself in *Person*, or from *St. John the Baptist*, are represented as lying under the same *Obligation* to receive it under the like *Penalty* of that *Eternal Fire* which was *prepared* for the *Devil* and his *Angels*, in case they failed of doing so. The *Fire* threatned by our *Lord* himself to his own *Auditors*, is the *ἑννα πυρὸς*, *St. Matth.* v. 22. xviii. 9. *St. Mark* ix. 43, 45. alluding to that of the *Valley of Hinnom*, which is generally understood of the *Tartarean Fire*. And that it is not misunderstood when it is thought so, appears from the *Epithets* ascribed to it, of its being *unextinguishable* and *eternal*, *St. Mark* ix. 43, 44, 45, 46, 48. And the same is implied in the *Worm* that is joined with it, that is said *never to die*. This would add no new *Degree* of *Terror* to the *Criminals*, that the *Fire*, or the *Worm*, were *Eternal*, if themselves might hope *not* to be so. Plainly therefore the *Punishment* here threat-

threatned, is such as belongs to *Immortal Spirits*, such as the *Devils* themselves are, and such as *they* also must be supposed to be, who are to be *qualified* for suffering the *Punishment* prepared for the *Devil* and his *Angels*. Nor did this *begin* with the *Preaching* of our Blessed *Lord* himself. The *earliest* *Epocha* of the *Gospel*, is from the *Preaching* of *St. John* the *Baptist*. Yet even he also supposes the same *Obligation* on his *Auditors*, to *join* with *him* in his *Doctrine* and *Baptism*, which were both of them *preparatory* to the *Doctrine* and *Baptism* of our *Saviour*. He warns them of the $\delta\epsilon\zeta\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\alpha\sigma\alpha$, *St. Matth.* iii. 7. *St. Luke* iii. 7. The same *Phrase* is elsewhere *paraphrased* by the $\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\eta\varsigma$, *St. Matth.* xxiii. 33. which plainly makes them liable to the *condemnatory Sentence* of the *Judgment* which is to be passed against the *Devil* and his *Associates*. This is the *Wrath* of *God* which *abides* on the *Disobedient*, *Eph.* v. 6. *Col.* iii. 6. that is for them who *obey* not the *Gospel*, in the *Epistle* to the *Thessalonians*. The *Wrath* prepared for the *Vessels* of *Wrath*, *fitted* for *Destruction*, *Rom.* ix. 22. The *Wrath* of the *Lamb*, the *great day* of his *Wrath*, *Rev.* vi. 16, 17. The *Wine-press* of his *Wrath*, *Rev.* xiv. 19. xix. 15. in allusion to the like *Phrase* in *Isaiah*. That *very Wrath* to come, from which it is our *Saviour's* *Office* to *deliver* us, *1 Thess.* i. 10.

This can be no other but the *Wrath* designed for the *Devils*, who are the proper *Sons* and *Vessels* of *Wrath*, which *Men* are no otherwise entitled to, than as they are of his *Party*. He warns them also of the usual Fate of *unprofitable Trees*, whose end is to be *cut down* and *cast into the fire*, St. *Matth.* iii. 10. This is a Similitude elsewhere used by our *Saviour* himself, St. *Matth.* vii. 19. 1 *John* xv. 6. It is taken from the Notions of the *Rustick Writers*, that when a *Tree* is *twice dead*, that is, for *two years* together has born nothing, it is then to be judged as past *hopes* of Recovery to its vegetative *Life*, and is therefore to be *cut down*, as *cumbring the Ground*, as being thenceforward no otherwise useful than for the *Hearth* on which it is to be *burned*. That is really the case of the *Vine* especially, which is most frequently compared with the State of our *Christian Life*, whose *Wood* is otherwise unuseful, and has nothing else to recommend it to the Care of Men besides its *Fruitfulness*. This is alluded to by our *Saviour* in his Parable. And by St. *Jude* in his ἀκαρπία, δις ἀποθνήσκοντα, ἐκελύοντα, v. 12. εἰς ὃ ζόρεται ἡ σήρατις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τελεῖσθαι, v. 13. This is plainly the σκῆλη ἐξώπρον, as described almost in the same Words, in 2 *Pet.* ii. 17. It is also joined with *Fire*, So 2 *S. Pet.* iii. 7. τῆς ἐμμένοι πυρὶ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν

τῶν ἀρεσῶν ἀνθρώπων. What can this be but that very *Darkness*, and that very *Fire*, which were prepared for the *Devil* and his *Angels*? These *ungodly Men* therefore must be such as have made themselves *Partakers* of his *Punishment*, by joining themselves to him in his *Rebellion*. Thus it appears, that from the very *beginning* of the *Publication* of the *Gospel*, the *Devil* has been proclaimed as a *publick Enemy* of the *Souls* of *Men*; and as a *Head* of all *Rebellion*, who should make all *Human Souls* also liable to those *Punishments* (which were indeed fitted to the *Nature* of *Devils*, though *preternatural* to *Men*) who should *not* join with *Christ*, in *Opposition* to him, upon the *Summons* of the *Gospel*. But there is nothing of this in the *Old Testament*. The *Devil* is there represented as *envious* of the *Prosperity* of *Mankind*, and an *Accuser*, and a *Suggester* of pernicious *Counsels*. But without any mention of any *Design* farther than *Temporals*. There he robbed *Adam*, and, by *Consequence*, his *Posterity*, of the *Temporal Felicities* of the *Visible Paradise*. There he tempts *Job* to *Impatience* and *Murmuring* against the *Divine Providence*, by the *Temporal Calamities* which *God* permitted him to inflict upon him. There he brought a *Plague* on the whole *Body* of *Israel*, by tempting
David

David to an ostentatious numbering of them. There he drew *Abab* into a War with the *Syrians*, which proved fatal to him, by being a *Lying Spirit*, prophesying Success in the Mouth of those *Prophets*, who had otherwise been used to *Truer Inspirations*. There he opposes the *High-Priesthood* of *Joshua* the Son of *Josedek*, by performing his Office of a *Slanderer* and *False Accuser*. But we can find nothing there concerning any Power allowing him for drawing *Human Souls* into a *Participation* of his *Punishment* in their *Separate State*.

8.
The Rab-
bins per-
fectly igno-
rant of any
Divine
Tradition
concerning
the Natu-
ral Im-
mortality
of Hu-
mane
Souls in
general.

If I had thought *Rabbinical Testimo-
nies* satisfactory for proving *Opinions* re-
ceived among the *Jews* of the *Apostolical*
Age; more might have been said from
them for disproving the *Tradition* of the
Doctrine of the *Natural Immortality* of
Humane Souls. It is a Maxim with them,
that all *Israelites*, and none but *Israelites*,
are to have a Portion in the *Future Age*
under the *Messias*. This may indeed be
understood of the *Immortal Happiness* of
that *Age*, which they appropriate to their
own *Nation* and the *Profelytes* incorporated
into it, who can alone plead an *Interest* in
their *Messias*, as being of the same *Extraction*
with him. But this would again have per-
plexed them, in giving an Account of the
State of *Heathen Souls*, if the *Doctrine* of

the

the *Natural Immortality* of all *Humane*, even *Heathen*, *Souls* had been received by them as an *Original Divine Tradition* from their *Ancestors*. For this *Doctrine* would *exclude* them from *Eternal Happiness*. And *Eternal Misery* is too great an *Evil* to be inflicted on them by *Divine Goodness* arbitrarily. And their being of another *Nation*, could not *alone* be *Merit* sufficient for it. It was neither their *Crime*, nor was it their own *Choice*, but *Divine Providence*, that made them so. Nor can there be any *Third* *Eternal State* suitable to the *Nature* of a *Rational Soul*; neither *happy*, nor *miserable*, as there must be, if those *Souls* be *naturally Immortal*. I might mention those who interpret the Passage of *Psal. i.* that the *Sinners shall not stand in the Judgment*, of their *perishing* for ever. So the Famous *R. David Kimchi*. I might also mention those, who understand the *slinging* the *Souls* of the *Wicked* as out of a *Sling* of *Annihilation*, because it is opposed to *binding* in the *Bundle of Life*. *I Sam. xxv.* I might mention other *Rabbinical Authorities*, which make the *Deluge* and the *Fire of Sodom* *Specimens* of *Hell*; (*δαιμνα* is the Word in *St. Jude* concerning *Sodom*) and therefore *excuses* them from those *future Eternal Pains* of the *Day of Judgment*, by an *Annihilation*; as being *discharged* from the *real Punishment*, as having born it in *Effigie*.
Ac.

Accordingly they thought that those *Antediluvians* and the *Sodomites* were neither to rise again, nor to be presented before the Divine Tribunal at the *General Judgment*. As if they believed the *Souls* of those Delinquents *extinguished* immediately on the Dissolution of their *Bodies*. So the Excellent Dr. *Windet*, §. 9. This Observation of those *Rabbins* is directly *contrary* to that of Dr. *Hammond*, who thinks them *actually* punished with *Eternal Torments*, for that very *same* Reason; but otherwise interpreted, because they were *δέρματα αιώνις πυρός*. But that is none of my Concern at present. The Use I make of these Observations now, is only to shew, that our *present Rabbins* know of no *Tradition* derived from their *Ancestors* concerning the *Natural Immortality* of *Human Souls*. For by the same Reason for which they believe *some* Human Souls *actually Mortal*, they *must* believe all *naturally* so, if they believe our *Human Generation Univocal*, and that *Human Souls* are *all* of the same *Nature*. The *Divine Attribute* of *Goodness* will more easily allow of an *Arbitrary Advancement*, than of an *Arbitrary Debasing*, of what God himself has been pleased to make an *Ingredient* in our *Natural Constitution*. The innocentest way therefore of making them *actually Die*, is rather to leave such *Souls* to the *Consequences* of their *own Nature*, unassisted by
extra-

A PRÆMONITION.

xliv

extraordinary and therefore *undue*, Divine Influences; than *directly* to *destroy*, or to *deny* them *arbitrarily* any thing *necessary* to their *Subsistence*, by the *Exigency* of their *Nature*; which *Exigency* also is occasioned by a *Law* made by himself. But, I confess, I have not that Opinion of *Rabbinical Traditions*, as to take them for competent Proofs of the *Opinions* of their *Ancestors* of the *Apostles* Age; without better corroborating Proof, that such *Opinions* were *then* received. I have therefore chosen to insist on such *Testimonies* as were, in my Opinion, more *conclusive*; that is, of those who *lived* in that *Age* themselves.

I have withal here shewn, that this *Divine Spirit* cannot *now* be received from any but *Bishops*, as *Successors* to the *Apostles* in all the *highest* Acts of their *Ordinary Authority*; which was *not* to fail upon the extinction of the *Persons* of the *Apostles*, as grounded on those *Extraordinary Gifts* and *Rights* which were only *Personal*, and were *extinguished* with their *Persons*. But much more so, as they are *Successors* of our *Lord* himself in that very *Prerogative* wherein he was *above* all the other *Apostles*, either *singly* understood; or *collectively*, as He was the *Visible Head* of the *Mystical Union* of the *Spirit*; so that none of *them* could have the *Divine Spirit*, unless they

9.
The Right here insisted on of the Bishops alone for conferring the Spirit, destroys all Right to the Mystical Heavenly Communion in them who are divided from their respective Bishops.

they received it from *him*. Nor could they *continue* it any longer than they *continued* their *Communication* with *him*, any more than a *broken Branch* of a *Vine* can *continue* its *Vegetative Life* any longer than it *continues* its *Incorporation* in the *Vine* for deriving those *present* and *perpetual Influences* which are as necessary for *continuing* this *Vegetative Life*, as *deriving* it at *first*. Nor any more than a *Member* of our *Animal Bodies* can *continue* its *Animal Life*, without *Communion* with the *Head*; from which *all the Body*, by *Joints* and *Bands* having *Nourishment* ministred, and *knit together*, *increaseth* with the *increase* of *God*, Col. ii. 19. These are *Scripture-Examples*, explaining the necessary *dependence* of the *Members* of the *Mystical Body* on their *Head*, in order to their *Participation* of this *Divine* and *Immortal Life*, to which we are entitled by the *Spirit*. And this *Reasoning* is used in these *Sacred Writings*, with a particular regard to the *Visible Body* of the *Church* in this *World*, to convince its *Members* of their unavoidable *Duty*, to *continue* in its *External Visible Communion*, and in *Subjection* to its *Visible Head*, if they will *continue* their *Right* to the *Invisible Communion* of the *Spirit*, and their *Mystical* influences from the *Father* and the *Son*, as *Heads* of that *Mystical Communion*, as transacting all their *Covenanting Commerce* with *us* in
this

*this Life, no otherwise than by the Visible Heads deriving Authority from them, to represent and conclude them. So St. John Reasons in his first Catholick Epistle, for proving a *κονωρία* with himself and his Fellow Apostles necessary in order to the maintaining the Mystical Invisible *κονωρία* with the Father and the Son. St. Cyprian makes it as impossible to continue the Vital Spiritual Influences in Members separate from the Visible Body, and rebelling against its Visible Head, as it is to continue a stream upon an interruption of it from its Fountain, or a Sun-beam upon the interposition of an Opacous Body between it and the Sun. The Reasoning holds still as long as the World, and the Church in this World, lasts. For the Covenant is still the same to oblige the Church in Heaven by Acts of the Church on Earth; and to oblige all the Members of the Church in Earth to their Duty to their Earthly Superiours in affairs of this Nature, under Pain, if they violate that Duty, of overthrowing all their pretensions to Benefits to be ratified in Heaven. The Body of the Church now, is as much the same with what it was in the Apostles Age, as it is possible to be in a Body consisting of Mortal Individuals. And therefore the Government is the same suitably to the Nature of the Body, the same Apostolical Power conveyed downwards through a succession of Mortal Men,*
such

such as the *Apostles* themselves were. And therefore if a *Rebellion* against them *then* was a *Rebellion* against the *Father* and the *Son*, it must be so *still*, and leave the *Rebels* destitute of all the invaluable *Benefits* of *Mystical Communion*. And the *Reasoning*, I have here insisted on, proves it to be so *à Priori*. The *Mystical Communion* is the *Communion* of the *Spirit*, by which we *communicate* with the *Father*, as the *Spirit* is his *Seed*, and as our *participation* of that *Spirit* does entitle us to be his *Sons*, in a *higher* and a more *peculiar* way than the *ων* or *Flatus* does, which is *common* to all *Mankind*, though *that* also does in a *lower* way entitle all who have it to be his *Offspring*. However, as this *κωανία* makes us of one *Civitas* or *Patria* with the *Father*, so it is the *peculiar Prerogative* of this *higher* and *Diviner Spirit*. For this alone qualifies us for *ascending* to *Heaven* properly so called, which the *Scripture* represents as the *peculiar Residence* of the *Father*, and to which it is the *Sons Office* to *bring* us when he finishes his *Mediatorial Office*, and *delivers* up his *Government* to the *Father*. That is the *time* for *bringing* the *many Sons* *unto glory*. By it we also *communicate* with the *Son* as having the *Fulness* of the *Spirit*, from *whom* we must derive our *share* of it, our *Grace for Grace*, according to the *measure* he is pleased to allot us, respectively.

If

If therefore *this* be derivable only from the *Bishop*, how can we expect any of the *Benefits* of the *Cælestial Communion*, but by *Visible Communion* with the *Bishop*? And that this was the Opinion of those who lived in that *part* of the *Apostles Age*, wherein the *Ordinary Government* of the *Church* was settled (who could not possibly be ignorant what *Rights* were designed for that *Sacred Order*) appears from hence, that the *Bishop*, and he alone, was then taken for the *Authorized Representative* of *God* and *Christ*, as I have shewn in my *Paranesis*, from the best *Witness* now extant of those *Times*, the *Apostolical Ignatius*. I am sure, a far more competent *Witness* than the *Guesses* and *Reasonings* of *Blondel*, and his *Party*, from *Negative Testimonies*, before any *Ordinary Government* was settled. From hence it appears that the *Bishop alone* could oblige *God* and *Christ* to give the *Spirit*, because he only was their *Authorized Representative*, who had it in their *Power* to give it. The rather so, because he represented them, not by any thing that was *Common* to him with *Ordinary Presbyters*, but by what was *peculiar* to him on account of his *Right* to the first *Chair*. He, and he alone, who was the *Head* of the *Presbytery* could represent them as *Subordinate Heads* of the *Mystical Unity*. He, and he alone, could represent them as a *Principle* of *Unity*, who

c

could

A PRÆMONITION.

could oblige the whole Church to be, and continue, one Body, by obliging them all to acquiesce in the determinations of a single Person, who could not otherwise divide the Body, than by being divided from himself. Nor could he more effectually maintain this Unity of the Spirit, than by having this Ministerial distribution of the Spirit appropriated to his Office, as our Blessed Saviour had the distribution of the particular Gifts and Graces of the Spirit, by being himself the Fulness of this Divine Seed of the Spirit, from whom all others were to receive it, if they would pretend to any good Title to it. Thus then the Reasoning would proceed, that all Pretenders to the Spirit who had not received it from the Bishop could not have that Divine Spirit, which was the Bond of Mystical Ecclesiastical Unity: and therefore could have no other but the ill Spirit, since our Lord had taken away all pretences for Neutrality, by declaring them all publick Enemies, who were not joined with himself; and by declaring them Despisers of himself, who despised his Authorized Vicegerents. Nor has Blondel produced one single Instance, of the Baptism of the Spirit's being administred by any ordinary Presbyter before the IVth Century; nor even then any allowed Instance that it was ever so administred but by the leave of the Bishop. It is strange that he should
make

make the *prohibitory Canons* an Argument that this liberty of *giving* the *Baptismal Spirit* was the *Right* of *common Presbyters* Originally, when he could not find any *Example* that *Ordinary Presbyters* did pretend to give it before the now-mentioned *Century*, either with, or without, the *Bishops leave*. All he could infer from thence, could only be, that some *private Presbyter* had *pretended* to this Power before the *Canons* which *prohibited* them. But that they did it, as claiming an *Original Right* to do it, he *has* not, he *could* not prove. The *contrary* appears, that none but *Bishops* were thought to have a *Right* to *give* the *Spirit*, by Testimonies much *elder* than those *Canons*. It is supposed on both sides in the elder Disputes concerning the *Validity* of *Baptisms* by *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*. However they differed concerning the *Water-Baptisms* of *opposite Communions*, yet they neither of them believed the *Spirit* given out of the *Church*, nor without the *Imposition* of *Hands* of a *Catholick Bishop*. And it is notorious in the *allowed Practice* of the *Church*, that *none* but *Bishops* were *owned* to have the *Right* of *Admitting* to *Communion*, or *excluding* from it, which was a *real Consequence* from this *Right* of their *giving* the *Spirit*, or *withdrawing* it, by which this *nomos* was to be maintained, as being indeed no other than the

ἡτοιμασθαι ἀντιμαχῆσθαι. Accordingly the *Bishops* own none other for their *Collegues* but their *Fellow Bishops*. None had the *Right* of giving or receiving *Communicatory Letters* as addressed to them but *Bishops*. Not even the *Presbyters* in a *full See*, any otherwise than by the *Bishops Orders* or *Permission*. If they did otherwise, they are counted *Rebels*, as well as other *Affronters* of the *common Authority* of the *Society*. None others had a *Right* of *subscribing* *Definientes* to their *Synodical Canons*, as being those alone who could *undertake* for their respective *Bodies*. They, as *immediately* representing *God* and *Christ* were, on that account, believed *Supreme* and *Unappealable*, within their own respective *Districts*, in particulars belonging properly to their *Spiritual Jurisdiction*. And it is counted as *absurd* to judge of such a *Cause* determined by the *Bishop*, as to judge of *God* and *Christ*, from whom they were believed to have received such an *unaccountable* Authority. So *St. Cyprian*, and the other *Bishops* of his *Age*, among whom a *Catholick Correspondence* was maintained on this *Principle*. So the *Apocalyptick* Angels, who are commended for all the *Good*, and charged with all the *Blame*, of their respective *Jurisdictions*. Which could not have been if they had been *controulable* by a *Majority* of *Suffrages* of their several *Presbyteries*.
 They

A PRÆMONITION.

liii

They governed indeed by the *Counsel* of their *Presbyters*, but were no more *determined* by the *Majority* of their *Suffrages*, than our *Princes* are by the *Suffrages* of their *Councils*, though their *Edicts* run in that *Form*, as if they had been issued by their *Advice* and *Authority*. That very Learned Man, in his most elaborate Collection, has not produced any single *Instance* of any thing *referred* to the *Suffrages* of the *Presbyteries*. So far he is from any thing that was carried in them *against* the *persevering* Sense of the *Bishop*. So far is this *Moderatorship* of a *Chair-man* from the true Power of *Primitive*, *Catholick*, *Apostolick*, *Episcopacy*.

This Argument I have insisted on, with a particular Regard to the Case of those *Enthusiasts* mentioned in the Letter now transcribed. But it fits the Case of *Separatists* from *Episcopal* Communion, of what Denomination soever, as well as that of the *Enthusiasts*. None of them can expect the *Benefits* of any *privileged Society*, if they will not submit to the *Laws* and *Governours* of it. No, not unless they will submit to the *Governours* of it in *this World*, if God be pleased to incorporate it into a *Society*, even in *this World* also. None of them can expect to be treated otherwise than as *Enemies*, and as *Fellow-Rebels* with the *Devil*, when God has notified his Resolution

IO.
This dependence on Episcopacy, for receiving the Spirit, concerns the case of all Separatists from Episcopacy, as well as Enthusiasts.

lution to *treat* them as *Enemies*, and as *Subjects* and *Soldiers* of the *Devil*, who are wanting to themselves in *not joining* themselves to the *Body* of his own *Subjects* and *Favourites*, and to those *Governours* of it who derive that same *Authority*, as it is capable of being derived by *Mortals* at a distance, by a *Succession* from *Christ* and his *Apostles*, when they also were *visible* here on *Earth*. What can they pretend in this *Reasoning* incongruous to the *Nature* of *priviledged Societies* in general, or to the *particular Nature* of our *Christian Societies*, as settled by *Christ* and his *Apostles*? If they can shew nothing so, methinks they should not venture to censure *Ignatius* as *mad* or *blasphemous*, for declaring them *Servants* to the *Devil*, who *then* separated from *Episcopal Communion*. They may easily understand how much better he might *know Facts*, and *Doctrines* too, of the *Apostles* in their *latter times*, than *themselves* can *now*, who have *not* one even *Canonical History* of those *latter times*. They know withal how impossible it was for *him* to have been transported by any *Prejudice* against their own *Innovations*, which it was impossible for him to *know* without a *Divine Revelation*; which, if he *had*, it must have also been as impossible for him to have been *mistaken* in his *Judgment* concerning them. But I have shewn it perfectly agreeable to
the

A PRÆMONITION.

lv

the Sense of *those times*, as far as we can trace it from our few remaining Monuments. I have shewn, that God himself has contrived the matter so, that none can have the *Mystical Communion* without the Spirit; nor the Spirit without a *Visible Communion* that is *Episcopal*. This I think I have already proved, in what I have said concerning the Spirit. I have endeavoured to prove it likewise concerning *Remission of Sins*, and the *Incorporation* into the *Mystical Body of Christ* in both the *Sacraments*, which make us *one Body*, as well as *one Spirit* with him, and all the other *Benefits* consequent to that *Incorporation*, in a short Discourse drawn up many Years ago, upon the Subject of *Sacerdotal Absolution*; which, upon this occasion, I thought fit to communicate to the Reader. The rather so, because it proceeds on the same Topick of the *Divine Contrivance* of the *Spiritual Society*. Which is certainly more cogent than our Adversary's Reasonings from *Scriptures* elder than the *Constitution of Government* in any other Church, besides that of *Jerusalem*.

How little are our *Dividers* aware of these *Consequences* wherein they are so deeply concerned? And withal, how *impatient* of having them fairly represented to them? They possess themselves with *Prejudices* a-

II.

An applicatory Address to the Separatists, intreating

them to consider the Reasons here offered impartially.

gainst us, and pretend us *immoderate* for the *Severity* of our *Conclusions*, and take this for an *Excuse* for not *examining* into the *Merit* of our *Cause*. This is the way to make their *Cause* *desperate*, if our *Reasons* should prove indeed so *convincing*, and their *Danger* consequently so *great* as we believe it. And can they think us *immoderate* that we are not *indifferent* what becomes of their *Souls*, the Purchase of the Blood of our dearest Lord? Can they tell us how we can better express our *good Will* to them, than by that *vehement Concern* for their *Good*, which they are pleased to expose under the *odious* Epithet of *Immoderation*? Can they find in their Hearts to be *displeased* at us, for venturing the Effects of their present *Prejudices* against us, rather than suffering them to persevere *unwarned* in those Courses which we believe of so irreparably *pernicious* *Consequence* to those most *important* Interests which ought to be *dearest*, as to *themselves*, so to all who unfeignedly *love* them? But how can they, in earnest, *know* that we are *immoderate*, without entring upon the Consideration of the *Merit* of the *Cause*? They must not so interpret their Notion of *Moderation*, as to make its *Offices* inconsistent with the *Offices* of true *Zeal*, which are as unquestionably *obliging*, and as much *recommended* in the *Scripture*, as the *Moderation* they so much pretend

pretend to. And the best *Expedient*, I know of, for *judging* when *severe* Censures are to be judged *immoderate*, is to be taken from the *Merit* of the *Cause*; when that is first impartially settled. If the *Cause* be very *momentous*, and the *Evidence* great and certain, and the *Concern* no more than what is *suitable* to that *Momentousness* and *Evidence*; who can think the Censure *immoderate*, or exceeding the *Bounds* of due and just *Severity*, which is by all owned as a *Virtue*, and to contain nothing that a *good Man* needs to be *ashamed* of? This plainly requires their having *examined* it before they can be admitted as competent *Judges* of *Immoderation*. Till they have done so, it is impossible for them to *judge* how far the *Temper* of the *Person* is ingredient in the *asperity* of the *Censure*; because, till *then*, it is impossible for them to know how far the *Censure* is *just* and *reasonable*. Till *then*, they cannot judge for *themselves*. How then can they have that *higher* Degree of *Certainty*, which is requisite to qualify them to judge of the Case of *others*, whether they be acted more by *Reason* or Malignity of *Temper*. For this they must have that *Evidence* as themselves, at least, may judge sufficient, *not* only to satisfy *themselves*, but all *others* also who are not *wilfully* wanting to themselves. But I see no reason why they should concern *Persons*

sons at all in Disputes of this Nature. So far it is from being justifiable to *prejudge* against *Reasons*, upon a *Presumption* of *Ill will*, in the Person who produces them. It is no Concern of *private* Persons to judge at all of the good or ill *meaning* of Persons not committed to our *Charge*, where the Judgment is of no other use but pure *Speculation*. And *Hearts* of *Men* are far more difficult to be judged of, than their *Arguments*. Why should they change an *easier* for a more *difficult* Dispute? The *Cause* is that for which they must be responsible to *God* and their own *Consciences*. And the *Arguments* are they by which *God* will judge, whether they had sufficient *Evidence* to oblige them to *espouse* that *Cause*. And these, as they are not the *stronger*, so neither are they the *weaker*, for the *Indifferency* or *Zeal* of the *Proponents*. Let them therefore *secure themselves* by a solid and satisfactory *Answer* to our *Arguments*. And they will, at the same time, perform a *charitable* Office to *us*, in *easing* us of our hard *Opinions* of their *State*, if they can prove our hard *Opinions* *groundless*. Till they do so, they cannot expect it: Nor can they believe that we *love* them, or have that real *Concern* for *Souls*, which becomes *zealous Honourers* of our common *Lord* the *Lover* of *Souls*, if we can believe them in great *danger*, yet neither

warn

warn them of it, nor be vehemently concerned for them, while it is in their Power, upon warning, to avoid it. One would think the *Greatness* of the *Danger* should be a *Recommendation* of the *Love* that is shewn in warning of it. So we use to judge in Cases of incomparably less Importance. The good God, on whose Attribute our *Latitudinarians* so much depend, did not think it inconsistent with his *Goodness*, to threaten these *Evils*, which they judge so hardly of. No, nor to terrifie them, by such *Threats*, to make an *Election* of what is otherwise so advantageous to them. Why then should they misinterpret it as an Argument of *Ill will* to them, that we urge, with all possible *Importunity*, the same well-designed *Terrors* of the greatest and most sincere Promoter of their greatest *Interests*? The urging them can no more contribute to the bringing them upon them, than a wise *Physician's* warning of an Ailing (most certainly *Mortal* if neglected, but as certainly curable in them who secure themselves the Benefit of his good *Council*) can to the *mortality* that will unavoidably follow on the neglect. But the considering our Reasons, may either ease us of the Trouble our Good will to them occasions to us, if their Answers can be satisfactory: Or put them upon safer *Expedients* for their own Good,

A PRÆMONITION.

Good, if they should fall short of their *own* Expectation. Nor do we in the least *prejudge* them, if they can satisfy us that their Case is not so dangerous as we believe it. All we pretend to, in the mean time, is to *awaken* their *Diligence* in *considering* them, for which the *Importance* of the *Matter* is certainly a very proper Inducement. Ignorance of *Law* is not allowed as *pleadable* in any *Legal Courts*, when the *Law* it self, and the *Punishment* attending the Violation of it, are sufficiently *notified*. Nor is there any Relief of *Equity* admitted, if the *Criminal* himself cannot deny his having *heard* of the *Law*, and the severe *Punishment* threatned upon the *Violation* of it. That is presumed sufficient to oblige him, in regard of his own Interest, to use all *Moral* Diligence to inform *himself*, where his Misinformation may prove of so *Fatal Consequence* to him. And the greater the *Evil* is, to which his *Error* may expose him, the greater his *Obligation* is, to *prevent* an *Error* that may be so *pernicious*. This, and this alone, is my Design in being so *plain* and *particular* in my *Charges* against their Case, wherein their *Persons* are no otherwise concerned, than as they are *pleased* to make that very Case their *own*. It is to let them see their *Obligation* to *examine* the *Reasons* that *prove* their Case so dangerous; and that they are not

not at the same Liberty, *not* to trouble themselves with a serious and accurate *Examination* of them, as they might have been, if the *Case* concerning them had been *secure*, or not so very *dangerous* as indeed it is. And who can deny their *Case* to be *dangerous*, if it be such as our *Reasons* prove it, if they be indeed *conclusive*? If they can *neither* pretend to *Remission* of their *Sins*, tho' otherwise *qualified*, if they had been of the *Body* to which the *Promise* of *Remission* belonged: If they can pretend no Interest in *Christ*, neither of being *one Body*, nor *one Spirit*, with him: If they be *destitute* of the *Spirit* of *Christ*, and, for that Reason, still *subject* to the *Devil*, the capital *Enemy* of *Christ*, and thereby consequently liable to the *Punishment* prepared for the *Devil* and his *Angels*: Who can deny, but that these are *Considerations* sufficient to excite their utmost *Diligence*, at least, as to an impartial *Examination*? That is all that I design at present, not any way *prejudging* concerning the *Event*. If, upon that *Examination*, they can prove their present Condition *secure*, I shall heartily *congratulate* their *Success*. If they cannot, I know no *Expedient* that they can then be able to pretend for *securing* themselves, but that to which I have been so importunately *urging* them, that of a timely Return to a *safer Communion*, which can then be no other but *Episcopal*.

An

An Hypothesis concerning Sacerdotal Remission of SINS.

That Sacerdotal Absolution, is necessary for the Remission of SINS, even of those who are truly Penitent.

1. **B**Y *Sacerdotal Absolution*, I understand the *Priest's* Approbation of the *Penitent*, as a Person *interested* in those *Promises* of *Remission* which are revealed in the *Gospel*, however it be signified; whether by express *Words*, as it had been the Practice of the *Later Church*; or by *Behaviour*, proper only to a *Person* so *qualified*.

2. By *Necessary*, I mean, not *absolutely*, in regard of *God*; but *ordinarily*, in regard of the *Penitent*. So that the *Penitent* (who cannot expect the *Extraordinary* Uncovenanted Mercies of *God* for his *Salvation*) cannot expect *Remission* without this *Sacerdotal Absolution*, as a Condition *ordinarily* necessary.

3. By *Sins* I mean, not only such as are *notorious*, and *scandalous*, and of *Publick* Cognizance; but all such also, whatever they may be, whereby the *Priest* may be able to judge concerning the *State* of the *Penitent*, however he came to know them, whe-

Concerning Sacerdotal Absolution. lxiii

whether by *Personal Converse*, or *Private Information* by others, or the *Voluntary Particular Confession* of the *Penitent* himself.

P R O O F.

That no *truly Penitent Person* can expect Prop. I.
Remission of his *Sins* (at least in order to the obtaining those Good Things that are promised in the *New Covenant*) by virtue of the *Penitence* it self, without the *Divine Bounty* and *Indulgence* accepting it; not for its own *Worth*, but God's *Pleasure*.

Seeing therefore this *Acceptance* depends Prop. II.
on the *Divine Pleasure*, no *Penitent* can assure himself of *Acceptance* by any other Means, than by *such* whereby he may be assured that God is *pleased* to accept them.

The *Pleasure* of God to accept of *Peni-* Prop. III.
tents cannot otherwise be known, but by our *Interest* in the *New Covenant*, wherein he has been pleased to *declare*, that he *will* accept of them.

This *Remission* of *Sins* promised in the Prop. IV.
New Covenant cannot (in an ordinary way) be expected by any, but those who make use of the *Ordinary Means* prescribed by the *New Covenant*.

The *Ordinary Means* prescribed by the Prop. V.
New Covenant revealed in the *Gospel* for the *Remission* of *Sins*, are both the *Sacraments*.

But

Ixiv Concerning Sacerdotal Absolution.

But especially (for *daily* Inadvertencies, and *Relapses* after *Baptism*) that of the *Holy Eucharist*.

Prop. VI. They who are by God empowered to admit *to*, or exclude *from*, the *Eucharist*, (the *Sacrament* concerning *adult* Christians, of whom we are now chiefly discoursing) are also empowered to *apply* this *New-Covenant-Remission*, or exclude from it; so that without their *Consent*, no *Application* can be made.

Prop. VII. *Priests*, are they who are thus empowered to admit *to*, or exclude *from*, the *Eucharist* under the *Gospel*.

This Power of the *Priests*, for excluding *from*, or admitting *to*, the *Sacraments*, appears from these following Considerations:

1. *They*, and they *only*, can admit *to*, or exclude *from*, the *Sacraments*; who have a *Dominion* over the *Exterior Symbols*.

2. *They*, and they *only*, have the *Dominion* of these *Exterior Symbols*, who *alone* have the Power of *Consecrating* them.

3. *They*, and they *alone*, have the Power of *Consecrating* these *Symbols*, who are *Legally called* thereunto.

4. *They*, and they *only*, are *Legally called* hereunto, who are *separated* for this Employment by those who are already invested with the *Original Supreme* and *Independent* Power of the *Church*.

5. None

5. None are thus *separated* for this Employment of *Consecrating* the *Eucharist*, but only *Priests*, in the utmost Primitive *Latitude* of the Word, as it contains not only those who are strictly and rigorously so called, but *Bishops* also.

6. This *Power*, which necessarily follows from this *Appropriation* of the *Dominion* of the *Sacramental Symbols* to the *Clerical Function*, cannot be conceived to be given by Christ to them *unawares*, but *designedly*.

7. Christ therefore *designing* to put the *Ordinary Means* of *Remission* of *Sins* into the *Power* of the *Priesthood*, must consequently *oblige* all to a *Dependance on*, and a *Subjection to*, the *Priesthood*, under *Pain* of *Deprivation* of the *Ordinary Means* of the *Remission* of their *Sins*.

8. This *Obligation* will extend to all Cases wherein Men cannot *expect*; nay, and be *sure* of, God's *supplying* his *Want* of *Ordinary Means* by *Extraordinary Favours*. For no *Prudent* Person would venture himself on *Extraordinaries*, where he might have any *Hopes* left of being supplied by *Ordinary Means*.

9. There can be no *Hopes* of *Extraordinary Favours* but on a perfect *Impossibility*, either *Physical*, or *Legal*, of obtaining *Ordinary Means*.

d

10. This

lxvi Concerning Sacerdotal Absolution.

10. This *Impossibility* cannot be pretended, where the *Ordinary Means* may be had, either by any *Moral Diligence*, or by any *not unlawful Compliance*.

11. The Design of all this seems to be, to oblige all *Laicks* to a Voluntary Obedience to their *Clergy*, (even in *Times of Persecution*, when no other Means can be used) by a sense of their own greatest *Interest*, which is so highly concerned in paying that Obedience.

12. Supposing the Preservation of the *Priest's Authority* to be the End of this Design of *Christ*, that *Right* of the *Priests* will be the *principal* thing necessary to be secured by this Obedience. So that the Reception of the *Elements* will be no otherwise necessary to the *Remission* of our *Sins*, than as our Duty to receive those *Elements*, in order to that *Remission*, obliges us to depend on the *Consent* of the *Priests*, who alone can give us those *Elements*, and who alone can oblige God to ratify in Heaven what is transacted by them in Earth, by the *Authority* they have received from God himself.

13. However, this way of giving the *External Symbols*, is the *Ordinary Means* whereby *Christ* himself has obliged *Priests* to signify their *Consent* and *Approbation* of *Persons* to be admitted as *Members* of their *Body*, so as may most advance the *Edification*

Concerning Sacerdotal Absolution. lxvii

fication of the *People* in a way of *sensible Devotion*.

14. Yet where these *Arbitrary Means* cannot conveniently be provided, (whether through *want* of the *Elements*, or of a convenient *Number* of *Communicants* requisite for the Solemnity) there the *Priest* admitting of the *Person* as *fitted* for the *Reception* of the *Symbols*, if they might be had, by a *Form* of *Words*, signifying his *Approbation* of the *Qualifications* of the *Person* for receiving the *Symbols* themselves: This *Act*, I say, of the *Priest* may (by this *Reasoning*) as certainly *apply* the *Benefit* of the *Covenant* to the *Person* so disposed, as if the *Exteriour Symbols* themselves were administered to him.

15. But *whether* of these *two Means* be to be used (I mean of the *Symbols* themselves or of a *Verbal Absolution*) the *Communicant* is to be concluded by the *Priest*, as the *competent Judge*. The *Priest's Right*, not the *Communicants*, being here principally concerned; It thence follows that the *Judgment* of the *Priest*, not of the *Communicants*, concerning the convenient *time* for giving the *External Symbols* themselves, is herein to be principally regarded.

16. The *Priest* therefore being the *Competent Judge* of this *Case*; it follows that, though he were *mistaken* in *omitting* the use

lxviii Concerning Sacerdotal Absolution.

of the *Elements* without sufficient *necessity*, yet, the *Remission* of *Sins* (being grounded on the *Priests Right* of admitting to the *Privilege* of *Remission* by way of *Covenant*) is as *Validly* made over to the *Penitent*, as if he had not been so *mistaken*.

This *Hypothesis*, I conceive, to proceed on the most *unexceptionable* Principles of any that I have seen, most of its Foundations being *admitted* by our separating Adversaries themselves. I take it also to be most conformable to the *Evidence* of *Scripture*, and *Catholick* (especially *Primitive*) *Tradition* in these matters. It neither *affirms* any thing that is not *expressly* taught by the *Scriptures* and that *Tradition*; nor *determines* any thing that was then permitted to the *liberty* of *private* Disputants. I further take it to be most agreeable to the *Jewish* and *Heathen* Practices (from whence those *Rituals* were principally derived) of expiating *Piacular Criminal Persons*. Withall it seems to me to give the most *Rational* Account, why, under such a *Spiritual* Oeconomy, (as that is of our common *Christianity* professedly designed for the *Elevation* of Mens Minds above all *unnecessary* Condescension to Sense) *Christ* should yet be pleased to *approve* and *institute* the *Eternal Observation* of some few *Rituals*, which might *Cement* the *External*

Concerning Sacerdotal Absolution. Ixix

nal Unity of the *Visible Body* of the *Church* in this *World*. It is the further recommendation of this same *Hypothesis*, that it keeps the *Mean* betwixt making the *Absolution* of the *Priest* so *Operative*, as to excuse the *Penitent* from some part of his *Duty*; or, on the contrary, the *Penitence* of the *Person* (even when supposed *True*) so *Self-sufficient* as to supersede the necessity of the *External Intervention* of the *Priest*, for completing the *Absolution*, so necessary for the *Penitent*. These are the two *Extremes* under which all other *Hypotheses*, I think, have laboured. Nor is it less serviceable for removing those mutual *misunderstandings*, which the *inconvenient Explications* of these very important *Affairs* have occasioned, even among *Candid* and *Intelligent Persons*.

The Contents of the Præmonition.

THE Fragments of the Letters which occasion'd the following Discourse, §. 1. The Gentleman mistakes my Hypothesis, when he takes it to suppose the actual Mortality of all who are out of the Peculium, §. 2. The actually Immortalizing Souls to Punishment, may, possibly be better ascribed to the Pleasure of God, than to the Divine Spirit, §. 3. The Souls that are common to all Mankind, do not so depend on our gross organized Bodies, as that they must necessarily perish on their Dissolution from their Bodies, §. 4. This perpetuating of Human Nature for Punishment, could not be justly inflicted till a Publication of God's Pleasure, that he judged the Devil a publick Enemy; and that all who did not join the Body instituted by himself, should be taken for Associates of the Devil, and punished accordingly, §. 5. The Publication of the Devil as an open Enemy, began from the beginning of the Gospel, §. 6. It is supposed in the Preaching of our Blessed Saviour, and of St. John the Baptist, §. 7. The Rabbins perfectly ignorant of any Divine Tradition concerning the natural Immortality of Human Souls in general, §. 8. The Right here insisted on of the Bishops alone for conferring the Spirit, destroys all Right to the Mystical Heavenly Communion, in them who are divided from their respective Bishops, §. 9. This dependance on Episcopacy, for receiving the Spirit, concerns the Case of all Separatists from Episcopacy, as well as Enthusiasts, §. 10. An applicatory Address to the Separatists, intreating them to consider the Reasons, here offered, impartially, §. 11. An Hypothesis concerning Sacerdotal Remission of Sins, P. lxii.

T H E
C O N T E N T S
O F T H E
Epistolary Discourse.

THE Address. §. 1. *The Scripture owns all our Title to Immortality to proceed from the Spirit. Yet so, as to own the Immortality of them to Punishment, who hear the Gospel, tho' they do not receive it.* §. 2. *The Form of proceeding in the general Judgment, mentioned by our Saviour, supposes all who are to be concerned in that Judgment, to have heard of the Gospel.* §. 3. *The Scripture plainly supposes a great difference between the Punishment of them who never had heard of the Gospel,*
d 4

lxxii C O N T E N T S.

spel, and of those who had heard of, and rejected it. §. 4. Unbelievers are the Persons designed in the Scripture for Eternal Punishments. Who must therefore be supposed to have heard of the Gospel. §. 5. The Place of St. John v. 28, 29. answered. §. 6. The Doctrine of deriving Immortality from the Divine Spirit, is perfectly agreeable to the Notions received by the Jews in the Apostolical Age. §. 7. It is also agreeable to those Heathen Originals, from whence the Phrases of the New Testament concerning this Matter are derived. §. 8. The Doctrine is owned by S. Justin Martyr. §. 9. And by Tatian. §. 10. And S. Irenæus. §. 11. And Athenagoras. §. 12. And Theophilus Antiochenus. §. 13. Tertullian thought the Soul ex traduce, and therefore naturally Mortal. §. 14. That Opinion of Tertullian, though generally deserted in the end of the 4th Century (when the Opinion that favoured the natural Immortality of the Soul began) yet
was

C O N T E N T S. lxxiii

was not, even then, condemned. §. 15. Tertullian is also otherwise very full in asserting the natural Mortality of the Soul, and in deriving its actual Immortality from the Spirit. §. 16. Origen knew no Tradition of the Church in his Age against that Opinion of Tertullian, though himself differed greatly from it. No, nor Pamphilus, nor Eusebius. §. 17. S. Cyprian owns the same Distinction between our first Birth, by which we receive our Souls, and the second Birth, by which we receive the Spirit. §. 18. Arnobius owns our Souls mortal in their own Nature, and immortal only by the Spirit. §. 19. So also Lactantius. §. 20. S. Athanasius owns the natural Mortality of the Soul, and ascribes its actual Immortality to the Spirit received from the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\omega$. §. 21. The same S. Athanasius, and the Catholick Church with him, prove the Necessity of our Saviour's assuming even the Supreme part of our Human Souls against the Apollinarists, that even that might be rescued from

lxxiv C O N T E N T S.

from actual Mortality. §. 22. This Distinction between Soul and Spirit supposed in the Disputes with the Hereticks from the days of the Apostles themselves. §. 23. The Doctrine of the natural Mortality of the Soul, thus explained can have no ill Influence on our present Practice. §. 24. The Immortalizing Principle was generally believed not ingredient in the nature of the Human Soul, among the Heathens themselves. §. 25. The Primitive Christians disliked the Doctrine of the natural Immortality of the Soul, in Origen and others ; and reasoned on Principles inconsistent with the Belief of it. §. 26. The Immortality of the Soul, is a Revelation of the Gospel ; and therefore not capable of being proved by Reasons from the Nature of the Soul itself. §. 27. Even the Jews of the Apostles Age (though many of them believed the Immortality of Human Souls, yet) knew of no Divine Revelation that might assure them of it. §. 28. The Title to the Spirit on

C O N T E N T S. lxxv

*on account of the former Peculium was perfectly arbitrary: So they who were not profelyted into that Peculium, seem to have been so long left to their natural Mortality. §. 29. The Universality of those, who are mentioned as concerned in the Revelations of the Gospel, does not necessarily include any more of the Gentiles, than those who lived after the Preaching of the Gospel, and who had heard it preached to them. §. 30. There is no necessity, that all who died in Adam should be immortalized by Christ. §. 31. The Apostle intimates, that, in the space between Adam and Moses, they, who had not the Spirit, were left to their actual Mortality. §. 32. The Light that enlightens every Man that cometh into the World is the *φως*, not the *πνεῦμα*. §. 33. The Dead in Christ who are to rise first, are not opposed to the Dead out of Christ, but to those who do not continue in him till their Death. §. 34. They who knew of no Divine Law by which they*
were

lxxvi C O N T E N T S.

were to be judged, are supposed by the Apostle to perish, rather than to be concerned in the Judgment relating to the Breakers of the Law. §. 35. Yet they might probably persevere in their Being till the day of the general Judgment. The Punishment of the Sodomites not in Hell-Fire. §. 36. Nor could it be Hell-Fire which S. Jude (in the Case of the Sodomites) calls Eternal Fire. §. 37. The ~~even~~, which is in all Men, (though it be of a Divine Original, yet) does not make us actually Immortal, but only dispose us for a Union with the Spirit. §. 38. No Ordinary Means settled for conveying the Spirit before the Gospel. §. 39. Faith is (by the terms of the Gospel) requisite for receiving the Immortalizing Spirit. §. 40. Therefore the Antients (even of the Apostolical Age) believed that our Saviour preached to the separate Souls of those who deceased before the Incarnation. §. 41. Water-Baptism also necessary (by the Gospel) for receiving the Spirit. Which

C O N T E N T S. lxxvii

Which the Ancients believed to have been given to the separate Souls of them who had no means of attaining it when living, §. 42. Renunciation of the Devil, necessary for the Spirit. Which was also believed performable in the separate state, by those who could not know their Duty before. §. 43. The Gentiles also are owned by Hermas to have received the Spirit, by our Saviour's Baptism, in their separate State. §. 44. Our Saviour's Preaching was only to the Souls of the Jews, the Apostles was also to those of the Gentiles, according to the Doctrine of Clemens Alexandrinus. §. 45. No Patriarchal Covenants can oblige Posterity to consent to the hazard of Eternal Misery. §. 46. God's appropriating the Old Peculium did not exclude the Gentiles, then living, from the Benefit of the New Peculium, relating to their Souls. §. 47. The highest part of the Rational Soul (as distinguished from the Divine Spirit) is called a Spirit. Yet naturally Mortal. §. 48. Yet it is, in a lower

lxxviii C O N T E N T S.

lower *Sense*, Divine, *as being of a Divine Original, and as qualifying us for a Union with that truly Divine Spirit, by which we are actually Immortalized.* §. 49. *The Primitive Christians suppose this distinction of the Two Souls in Man, as Fundamental, in their Disputes with their Co-æval Hereticks.* §. 50. *They also suppose the Reasonable Soul it self to be a Derivation from Christ, as the Ἀγ. §. 51. Our Saviour, as Christ, was anointed in his Human Nature, by the fulness of the Divine Spirit. And, on that account, as well as that of the Ἀγ., he gained a Right of being styled the Son of God.* §. 52. *That same Spirit being the Seed of the Father, but derived to us by our Saviour, will make us the Sons of God, and Brethren of our Saviour.* §. 53. *The Spirit abiding in us, is a Privilege of the Gospel. What is meant by that Form of Speech.* §. 54. *The same distinction appears in this, that the Air is the proper Ἄδης for separate Souls; but*

C O N T E N T S. 1xxix

*but Heaven is the proper Abode of the Spirit. §. 55. This Spirit is the Principle of Mystical Unity, as obliging all that receive it, to depend on him from whom they all Originally received it. What is meant by 'Αυτοζωον, or having Life in himself. §. 56. Thus therefore all Members of Churches were obliged to depend on their respective Governours, in order to the receiving of the Spirit. §. 57. The Spirit was not, in the earliest Ages, thought derivable to any Members of the Churches, but from the Heads of those Churches. §. 58. None but Bishops were left, by the Apostolical Age, in possession of this Power of giving the Spirit. And they gave it by Unction, which none could consecrate besides themselves. §. 59. A naturally mortal Soul is more agreeable to be joined with a naturally mortal Body, as a Constituent of Human Nature, than a Soul naturally Immortal. §. 60. By this Distinction, the best and clearest Account may be given of the truly Catho-
lick*

lxxx C O N T E N T S.

lick Doctrine of Original Sin. §. 61.
The same Distinction gives an easie account of the Doctrine of Reprobation, so far as that Doctrine is Scriptural.
§. 62. *It gives withal, the easiest account of the Justice of Eternal Torments; particularly, with relation to the Cases of Infants dying Unbaptized, and of Heathens who never heard of the Gospel,*
§. 63. *The Conclusion.* §. 64.

T H E

T H E
DISTINCTION
B E T W E E N

Soul and Spirit,

Asserted from

Scripture and the Purest Antiquity.

A N D

The Great Use of that *Distinction*
shewn, in several of the *Diffi-*
cultest Questions in Divinity.

HONOURED SIR,

I Received both your Papers by Mr. Gadderer. But, not knowing who, or *The Address.* where you were, I was in hopes of a *Personal Conference* with you, on the Subjects mentioned by you, when my Affairs should call me to *London*. I was aware of the popular *Prejudices* against the Opinions you speak of, and was unwilling
B to

The Distinction between

to concern them any farther in the Disputes that occasion'd them, than needs I must, if I might have any Prospect of carrying my principal Cause against the *Schism*, without concerning them in it. Besides, I was afraid that a Subject of that *Consequence*, and wherein so many things were to be asserted against the most *received* Opinions, might take me off, and detain me too long from my other Studies; especially if they should prove *less* important to the *Publick*, than those from which they must divert me. These Considerations make me loath to think of *writing*, if I might have the Advantage of debating your Subjects by word of *Mouth*; yet finding these popular Prejudices to *increase*, I have at length been prevailed on, to enquire what Reason can be pretended for them; and to communicate the Result of my Enquiry to the *Publick*, that *others* may judge of them, as well as I my self, especially my truly *Catholick Superiors*.

2. I do not, I dare not, prescribe to better Judges. But this I can assure you, that the Sentiments you think so *hardly* of, would not be more acceptable to *me*, than they are to *you*, if I thought them either *Anti-Scriptural*, or against any truly *Catholick Principles*. So firmly we are agreed in *own the Immortality of them to Punishment, who hear the Gospel, tho they do not receive it.*

The Scripture owns all our Title to Immortality to proceed from the Spirit. Yet so, as to

those

those Standards of Revealed Truth. This I hope, may qualifie me for your Favour, in what I have to say. In truth, I am sensible how much I am beholden to your Favour, because I am conscious how little I have deserved it, and therefore dare not be so *ingrateful* as to *distrust* your Favour. But what is it, I beseech you, that can be thought, I do not say *Anti-Scriptural*, but even *Unscriptural*, in the Hypothesis on which I reason? Is it that I distinguish the *two Men*, the *Earthly*, and the *Heavenly*? Is it that I distinguish the two εἰκόνες of those two Men, and make the ψυχὴ, to be the εἰκὼν of the *Earthly Man*; and the πνεῦμα to be the εἰκὼν of the *Heavenly*? And does not the Apostle either expressly *say*, or as plainly *suppose*, those things in his Reasoning in 1 Cor. 15. as I do? Is it that I make the ψυχὴ a *Mortal Principle*, and the σῶμα ψυχικόν, called so *from* that Principle, *Mortal* also? or that I make the ψυχὴ, and not the πνεῦμα, to be all that we derive from the *Earthly Adam*, and whereby we bear the εἰκὼν of the *Protoplast*? And does not the Reasoning of the Apostle suppose all these things as plainly as I do? Why else does he expressly affirm, that we all *die* in *Adam*, supposing us to *be* in *Adam*, while we only bear his εἰκὼν, as we are in *Christ*, by bearing his εἰκὼν, which is the *Heavenly Spirit*? Why does he suppose this

ψυχικὸν σῶμα to be *corruptible and mortal*, in *opposition* to the πνευματικὸν σῶμα, with which when it is *invested* (that is the Apostle's own Phrase, ἐνδύσαθ' 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54. ἐπενδύσαθ', 2 Cor. v. 3, 4.) it is thenceforward said to have *put on Incorruption and Immortality*? *ib.* Why does he derive all the *Title* to the *Resurrection* from *Christ*, if it be due to all those, who neither *were*, nor were *qualified* to be *his*, as he is *Christ*, in *any* Sense; not even that *lowest* Sense, at least, of being *visible Members* of his *Mystical Body*, the *Church*? Such are by no means *qualified* for the higher *Mystical Union* of the *Spirit*; and whoever has *not* the *Spirit* of *Christ*, is *none* of his, Rom. viii. 9. To be sure he cannot pretend it on Account of *this* Reasoning of the *Apostle*, that derives all *Title* to the *Resurrection* from that very same *Spirit*. The *Apostle's* other Reasonings, do also *immediately* derive this *Title* from *Christ* himself. *If there be no Resurrection of the Dead, then is Christ not risen*, v. 13. *If the Dead rise not, then is not Christ raised*, v. 16. These Reasonings can only reach them who *sleep in Jesus*. 1 Thess. iv. 14. *the Dead in Christ*, v. 16. not as opposed to them who are dead *out of Christ*, but to those *Christians* who shall be *alive* at the *Resurrection*, v. 17. For as *Adam* and *Eve* are called *Adam*, Gen. v. 2. so *Christ* and his *Church* are called *Christ*, 1 Cor. xii.

12. And *Christians* are said to be in *Christ*, as well as *Christ* in *them*, *John* xvii. 23. *Rom.* viii. 1. xvi. 7. But then they are said to be in *Christ* who *profess* him, though they do *not* live *answerably* to their *Profession*. As *Judas*, the *Son of Perdition*, is said to be *given* to *Christ* by his *Father*, *John* xvii. 12. And they are said to be *bought* by *Christ*, who *deny* the *Lord* that *bought* them, and who, by *denying* him, do *bring upon themselves* *swift Destruction*, 2 *S. Pet.* ii. 1. As they are said to go *out* of the *Church*, who *never* were *really* of the *Church*, 1 *S. John* ii. 19. So *Christ's Net* includes the *Bad* as well as the *Good Fish*, *S. Matth.* xiii. 47, 48. As the *Field of Christ* contains the *Tares* as well as the *Good Seed*, v. 24, 25. And this very agreeable to the *Design* himself so frequently owns in the *Scriptures*, of *punishing* them the most *severely*, who had been admitted to the greatest *Favours*, as thereby making their *Wickedness* the more *piacular*. This will perfectly reach all that have been actually *profelyted* to the *Christian Religion*, and admitted actually into *Christian Communion*. Nor can it be thought *hard* dealing, if God be pleased to *oblige* all (that *hear* of the *Gospel*, and have it in their *Power* to be so *admitted*, if they please) to entitle themselves to *Eternal Rewards*, under pain (in case of their being wanting to themselves therein) of incur-

ring *Eternal Punishments*. This also seems rather agreeable to the *Design* of God to do so, when the Apostles insist on this Topick of the *future Judgments* for obliging *Prose-lytes* to come over to the Christian Religion. So St. Paul does with the *Athenians*, *Acts* xvii. 31. and with *Felix*, *Acts* xxiv. 25. plainly intimating, that *they* must be concerned in that *Judgment*, if they did not secure themselves by embracing the *Gospel* and the *true Communion*; so they also explain themselves, when consulted by their Auditors, what they should do to be *saved*. *Acts* ii. 38. 40. xvi. 31. No doubt the *Salvation* intended in these Cases, was from that which is elsewhere called *the Wrath to come*. Thus this Hypothesis will concern all who have the *Gospel* preached to them. And it does not appear by the *accounts* of that *general Judgment* given in the *Gospel*, that any were concerned in that *Judgment*, besides those who had *warning* of that *Judgment*, by having the *Gospel* preached to them.

3. Our *Saviour* himself, in his own Description of it, ascribes all the *Rewardableness* of the good Works of the *Righteous*, to their having been done for *his* sake. He could not otherwise say; *In as much as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my Brethren, ye have done it unto me*, S. Matt. xxv. *The form of proceeding in the general Judgment mentioned by our Saviour, supposes all, who are to be concerned in that Judgment, to have heard of the Gospel.*

xxv. 40. So, on the contrary, he imputes the *Punishableness* of the *Uncharitableness* of the *Wicked*, to their affronting and neglecting *himself*, in neglecting the Performance of good Offices to the meanest of his Members ; *In as much as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me*, v. 45. Both these Sentences suppose the *Persons* concerned in them, not ignorant that *Christ* had undertaken to reward Benefits conferred, and to punish Neglects of doing such Benefits, to the *Members* of his *Mystical Body*. Yet his making such a *Body*, and the *Obligation* resulting thence to concern *himself* for them, being things wholly depending on his Arbitrary *Pleasure*, were impossible to be known, without the *Revelations* he was pleased to make of his *Pleasure* in the *Gospel*. It was impossible for any to do *Charity* on *Christ's* Account, or to affront *him* in neglecting it, who never had heard that there was a *Christ*, or that he had been pleased to concern *himself* in the *Benefits* or *Injuries* of his *Worshippers*. These *Forms* therefore could never affect *Persons* who had never heard of the *Revelations* of the *Gospel* : If therefore such *Persons* are to be judged there, it must be by another *Form* which cannot be known, and therefore ought not to be believed, till it can be proved from the *Scriptures*. Yet I exclude not the good *Deeds* and *Sins* of the *Jews*,

The Distinction between

before Christ's coming, from those Rewards and Punishments. For Christ, as the Ἀρχὴ was their Governour then, as their Government was Theocratical, which was a Favour granted then to no other Nation but theirs. For the Father was not supposed to govern them immediately, but was supposed to have committed all Judgment to the Son, S. Joh. v. 22. And therefore the ἐπιφάνειαι or Apparitions of the Deity in the Old Testament are generally in the New Testament supposed to have been of the Ἀρχή, the Father being conceived to dwell in the Light unapproachable, whom no Man either hath seen, or can see and live. Accordingly they who tempted God in the Wilderness are said to have tempted Christ, 1 Cor. x. 9. and elsewhere to grieve his Holy Spirit. That Spirit which, in this Reasoning, is supposed to immortalize to Punishment. So also Christ is said to have preached to the Spirits in prison, in the days of Noah, 1 S. Per. iii. 18, 19, 20. as is commonly conceived. Those Spirits, as I have shewn in my Discourse concerning Marriages, were the Descendents of Seth. who were supposed to have been restored to the Spirit which Adam lost by his Fall. And this was, in this way of Reasoning, conceived sufficient to make the Injury redound to Christ whose Spirit they had received, and (upon their Fall) to immortalize them to Punishment. These, by the
New

New Testament Reasonings, are concerned in the last Judgment. But where does the *New Testament* suppose that *they* shall be concerned in it, who knew nothing of *Christ*, or the *Αὐτὸς*, or of any Concern they had with him? Your *Texts*, I think, prove no such matter. The *Children of the Kingdom*, *S. Matth. viii. 12.* were not only *Jews*, who had a Title to the *Spirit in Reversion*, which was sufficient to qualify them for that higher degree of *Punishment*, of the *οὐκ ἐξ ὧν*, the same with *τάραχος*, proper for those only of a *Divine Nature*; but were such of them also as had heard and rejected the *Preaching* of the *Gospel*. For such only were cast out, by the *Apostles* casting off the *Dust* of their *Feet* for a *Testimony* against them. As for your other *Text*, *Acts xvii. 31.* of *God's* judging the *World* in *Righteousness*; the *Apostle's Design* is fully answered, if it fully reached the *Case* to which the *Apostle* applies it, that is, of all those to whom he was then *Preaching*. And they to be sure had heard the *Revelations* of the *Gospel*. Nor does the *Word World* necessarily imply any larger Signification. The *Apostles* were the *Light of the World*, *S. Matth. v. 14.* most certainly not of that part of the *World* which lived before, and could not therefore hear their *Instructions*, nor receive them as conveyed by *Tradition*. So the *Pharisees* observe that the whole

The Distinction between

whole World was gone after our Saviour, S. *Joh. xii. 19.* Here it was impossible that any more could be meant than *they* who lived in our Saviour's time, and heard his Preaching. Yet even *they* are called, not only the *World*, but the *whole World*, which is a more comprehensive Expression than that which is used in your Text. Your Text, *Hebr. x. 27.* wants the *universal* Particle, on which your Argument is grounded. The words are, καὶ καθ' ὅσον ἀποκρίεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀπ᾽ ἀπ᾽ ἀποθανέντων, μετὰ τὸ τοῦ κρείσσου. Nor does the Force of the Apostle's Argument require it. The *Emphasis* lies on the Particle ἀπ᾽, that is sufficient to shew what the Apostle collects in the following Verse: That it was not requisite for Christ, as a Man, to die any more than once: But that, as other Men, after that one Death, were to be judged; so Christ also, after his passage through that one Death, had no further part of his Mediatorial Office to be performed by him, but that of his Share in the Judgment, that of a Judge on the Tribunal, not that of Ordinary Men, as Criminals at the Bar. The whole stress of this Argument lies on these two things: that the Death was to be but once, and that Judgment was to follow after it. Not in the least on the Universality, either of the Death or the Judgment. You mistake my Sentiments concerning the Jews, as if I did not think

think

think *them* liable to *Eternal Punishments*, as well as the *Christians*. They who heard the *Gospel* might, as I have shewn, very justly be obliged to chuse *Eternal Rewards*, under Pain of *Eternal Punishments*. And they who lived before the *Gospel*, and could not hear, yet, as they were intitled to the *Spirit in Reversion*, so might be intitled to the *Consequences* of the *Spirit*; one of which was to make them *immortal* in the State to which they should be intitled by the Use of their *Free Will*, whatever that State was, whether of *Reward* or *Punishment*.

And really the Revelations of the New Testament are very clear in owning a very great difference in the *Punishment* of those who should resist and reject the *Gospel*, from what it would have been, if they had never heard of the *Gospel*. What else can be the meaning of those plain Words of St. Paul? *The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men every where to repent; because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by the man whom he hath ordained*, Acts xviii. 30, 31. So the same Apostle elsewhere; *Who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways*, xiv. 16. The Words are, *καὶ οὐκ ἐβουλόμην* and *ἐξουσίαν* which could not properly be used on this Occasion, if God had obliged all other Nations, as well as the *Peculium*,

4.

The Scri-
pture
plainly sup-
poses a
great dif-
ference
between the
Punish-
ment of
them who
never had
heard of
the Gospel
and those
who had
heard of,
and re-
jected, it.

The Distinction between

culium, to worship *himself*, before he had revealed his Pleasure to them : And if he had resolved to *punish* them for not doing so, with *Eternal Torments*. The Words do rather plainly imply the contrary ; That while the *Supreme God* was *ἄγνωνος*, (that is plainly the *ἄγνωα* alluded to) God would *excuse* them from that *Duty*, on Account of that *Ignorance* of what otherwise would have been their *Duty*, if it had been *required* from *them*, and they had *known* that the *Supreme Being* had *required* it. But that *God* was for the *future* pleased to *insist* on it ; and that they must not *hereafter* [vñ, from the time the *Apostle* as *God's Herald* promulged this *New Law* : So that they could not hence-forward *pretend* the like *Ignorance*,] I say, that they must not *hereafter* expect the like *Indulgence* as was allowed them *before*. It is plainly *proclaiming* *God's Pleasure* in a Case of which they were *ignorant before*, that *God* would *judge* the *World*, and that our *Blessed Lord* was appointed for the *Judge* to whom they must give up their *Accounts*. This agrees exactly with the Account our *Lord* himself gives of that *Judgment* ; that he would reckon all the *good* and *ill* Offices of *all* that should *appear* before him, as offered to *himself*. And, upon this *new Authentical Publication* of *God's Pleasure*, he farther declares, That they must not look on
this

this *New Law*, as formerly, as concerning *only his own People the Jews*, but *all Men*; nor as confined to *Palæstine*, and the several *Residences* of the *Jewish Colonies*, but as obliging *every where*; and that *all Mankind* should receive the *Gospel* revealed by *Christ*, as they would answer the contrary at their *Peril*, when they should appear before his *Tribunal*, at that *Day* which *God* had appointed for judging them. This *Reasoning* plainly supposes their *Concern* in that Judgment, to commence from the *Time* of the *Promulgation* of this *New Law*; from which time their *Ignorance* could not pretend to be *invincible*. So far is it from supposing every *Individual Man* to be concerned in it. And indeed the *Scripture* does every where suppose the Condition of those who resist the *Gospel-Dispensation*, worse than those of the worst sort of *Criminals* who never heard of the *Gospel*. So *St. Peter*; *It had been better for them not to have known the way of Righteousness, than after they have known it, to turn from the holy Commandment delivered unto them*: 2 *St. Pet. ii. 21*. This is the same *Ignorance*, and the same *Commandment* now mentioned by *St. Paul*. Thus the Condition of *Tyre* and *Sidon*, and even of *Sodom*, is said to be *more tolerable* in the *Day of Judgment*, than that of *Chorazin*, and *Bethsaida*, and *Capernaum*; where our Saviour had

The Distinction between

had done his *mighty Works*, attesting his *Authority* for publishing this *New Commandment*, St. Matth. xi. 21, 22, 23, 24, St. Luk. x. 12, 13, 14, 15. This *Tolerableness* must relate rather to the *Evils*, than the *Excusableness* of their *Case*; in regard of the greater *Evidence* used for *reclaiming* the one, than the other. And the *Case* is clear upon these *Principles*, that the *Punishment* of the *Ἰουδαῖοι*, and of those who were only *Psychical*, would not extend to the *outer Darkness*, and the *nethermost Hell*, which was to be the *Share* of those who were *Pneumatical*. And our *Saviour* seems to allude to it in these words; *And thou Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell*. Intimating that the *Capernaïtes* Capacities of *Heaven*, by having the *Gospel* Preached to them, was the very *Consideration* that made them *liable* to the *Punishment* of *Hell*; which *they* had no *reason* to *fear* who never had received that *Favour* from *God*, which might have entitled them to *extraordinary* and *supernatural* Rewards.

5.
Unbelievers are
the Persons
designed in
the Scri-
ptures for
Eternal Punishments;
who must therefore be
supposed to have
heard of the Gospel.

To this purpose serve those many *Texts* that are commonly observed, yet for *another* purpose, that make *Hell*, in a *peculiar* way, the *Reward* of *Unbelievers*. So, *He that believeth not, shall be damned*, St. Matth.

xvi. 16. This is plainly spoken of *disbelieving* the Gospel, when preached. And the *κατάκρισις* relates to the *κρίσις* which belongs to our Lord, as Judge at the last Judgment. So, *He that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the Name of the only-begotten Son of God, St. Joh. iii. 18.* By ranking themselves among those whom he has already declared as belonging to his *Left Hand*. So, *He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him, vers. 36.* That they all might be damned, who believe not the Truth, 2 Thess. ii. 12. So Hell is called the *Portion of Unbelievers, S. Luk. xii. 46.* But the fearful, and unbelievers, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death, Rev. xxi. 8. That other Criminals are added here, is to shew, that even the Profession of the True Communion will not secure Persons guilty of such flagitious Sins from the Portion of Unbelievers, if they add not a further Care of securing themselves by their Repentance. But the Unbelief here spoken of, is not the fiducial Recumbency on the Mercies of Christ, as they fanſie who are fullest of the Texts that mention it, but the disbelief of the Revelations of the Gospel, when-

The Distinction between

when-ever they are sufficiently proposed. So the *Scriptures* themselves explain it : *In flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, 2 Theff. i. 8, 9. What shall the end be of them that obey not the Gospel of God ? 1 S. Pet. iv. 17. Unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the Truth, but obey Unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every Soul of Man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile, Rom. ii. 8, 9. Thus it is that the $\pi\iota\sigma\omicron\iota$ and $\alpha\pi\iota\sigma\omicron\iota$ take in all of the two opposite $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\omega\nu\iota\varsigma$ of Righteousness and Unrighteousness, of Light and Darkness, of Christ and Belial, of God and Idols, 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15, 16. So S. Paul. And S. John in his first Epistle, supposes all who are out of the true Communion, for that very Reason, to be in a State of Error and Darkness, and Death. The Darkness is that of which the Devil is the Prince and Ruler. And the Death is the second Death. Thus therefore it appears, that in the Scripture-Reasoning, the Faithful and Unfaithful, exactly answer the two States concerned in the general Judgment, on the Right Hand and the Left, as headed by Christ, and his Adversary the Devil,*

Devil, as *Generals* of two *Armies* in *Hostility* against each other. The *Infidelity* therefore here meant, could not be a pure *Negative non-belief*, but a *Criminal disbelief* of the *Gospel*, when *preach'd* to them, and *attested* by it's *extraordinary Credentials*. By this Men came to be *formed* into these two opposite *Parties*. They who *received* the *Gospel*, and were accordingly received into the *Church* by the *Sacramental Symbols*, were supposed to belong to *Christ*, and to that *Body* of which he was the *Head*. They who *opposed* it, or would not be *Profelyted* by it, whatever *else* they *believed*, or to whomsoever they were *joyned*, they were, by the *Christians*, reckoned as belonging to the opposite *Party* to *Christ*, which was headed by the *Devil*. If therefore their *disbelief* of the *Gospel* was the *Cognizance* by which this *Party* was distinguished, it could consist of *none* but such as had *heard* and *rejected* the *Gospel*; and therefore could include *none*, but such as *lived* under the *Gospel*, at least of those who were *not* Originally of the *Old Peculium*. It is the *Apostle's Reasoning*: *How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a Preacher?* Rom. x. 14. The same *Reasoning* holds here. It is as *impossible* to *disbelieve*, as to *believe*, in him of whom they had not *heard*, or to *hear* of him without a *Preacher*. None

Occasion.
Comm.

C

there-

therefore can be *concerned* in the *Sentence* to that *Hell* which was prepared for the *Devil* and his *Angels*, but they who *hear* of the *Gospel*, if none but *Disbelievers* of the *Gospel* be *concerned* in it. And this fully agrees with what I have observed already, of the *form* of that *Judgment*, as our *Saviour* has described it. And it also fully answers the whole *design* of the *Apostles*, as often as they insist on this same *Topick*, to *oblige* those with whom they *dealt* (who either were *Profelytes*, or designed for such) to *Act conformably* to the *Injunctions* of the *Gospel*.

6. But there is a passage which may be thought *decisive* in this case. It is in the *Words* of our *Saviour*: *The hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the Resurrection of Life; and they that have done evil, unto the Resurrection of Damnation, S. Joh. v. 28, 29.* Here *all* that are in the *Graves* are said expressly to have their shares in *one* of the *two Final Sentences* of the last *General Judgment*: either the *Resurrection of Life*, or the other *Resurrection of Damnation*. If these *Words* were to be understood in the *Universality* they might imply, if *no* regard were had to the occasion of them: I might *then* be inclinable to believe that *all* men, who had *not* heard of the *Gospel* in *this Life*, might

The place
of S. Joh.
v. 28, 29,
answered.

might be admitted to the favour of having it *preached* to them in their *separate* state, in order to the rendring them *unexcusable* at the *general Judgment*. But there is indeed *no reason* to understand them as intended by our Saviour himself to *mean* so *universally*. It is usual with these Eastern Writers especially, to use these *large expressions*, when they mean no more by them than was requisite for the *occasion* on which they use them. The *Gibeonites* tell *David*, on occasion of the *Famine* for breach of *Faith* to themselves, by *Saul*, That they would have *no silver nor gold of Saul, nor of his house*, neither for them should he kill any man in *Israel*. These Words are as *universal* as the Words we are now concern'd for. Yet they immediately demand *seven* of *Saul's Posterity* to be delivered to them to be put to death, 2 Sam. xxi. 4, 6, 9. So *Obadiah* concerning his Master *Ahab's* diligence in enquiring for the Prophet *Elijah*: As the Lord thy God liveth, there is no Nation or Kingdom, whither my Lord hath not sent to seek thee: and when they said, he is not here; he took an Oath of the Kingdom and Nation, that they found thee not, 1 King. xviii. 10. Yet none can think that he meant it of any other Nations or Kingdoms but those only which bordered on his own Kingdom of the Ten Tribes. So S. Paul, I thank God that I baptized none of you, but

The Distinction between

Crispus and Gaius, 1 Cor. i. 14. Yet he afterwards owns that he had Baptized others: *And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other*, v. 16. So God granted to *S. Paul* all that sailed with him, *Act. xxvii. 24*. Yet it was on that condition, that they all would abide in the Ship, v. 31. In this Case God himself was concerned; but as acting according to the known and allowed Rules of *Veracity* in dealings between man and man. So the *Spies* at *Jericho* gave their Faith to *Rahab* for the security of her and her Family, *Josh. ii. 14*. But upon conditions afterwards mention'd, v. 17, 18, 20. In all these places *Limitations* were intended, though the words were indefinite, or general, not intimating any *Limitations*. Nothing therefore can be concluded from the *Universality* of the Expressions in this present place. And it was perfectly satisfactory to our Saviour's Design, if all those who heard him preach those Words should rise out of their Graves, and should be adjudged to one of those States of a *Resurrection to Life*, or a *Resurrection to Damnation*. That was sufficient to oblige his Auditors to embrace his Doctrine on both the inducements, by which Law-makers secure the Obedience of their Subjects, of Rewards and Punishments. And I have withal shewn it agreeable to our Saviour's design in the places now mention'd, that

that he should *not* mean these Words in a larger sense than this, of those who had heard of the Gospel.

This, I conceive, worthy Sir, sufficient to shew that this Doctrine is not indeed so *Antiscriptural* as you suppose. And no more can be required according to the *usual* ways of *proving* Doctrines *Scriptural*. But it very much confirms me in my Reasonings of this kind, when I find an *Interpretation* of the *Scriptures* not only agreeable to the *Words* of the *Scriptures*; but agreeable also to the *Notions* and *Significations* of *Words*, and *Reasonings* then received. For that *sense* which was most likely to be then *understood*, was, in all *likelihood*, the *true* sense intended by the Holy Ghost *himself*. * Other-
 wise there could be no *security* that his *true* Sense could be conveyed to *future* Ages, if they had been *themselves* mistaken in it, to whose *understandings* the *Holy Ghost* was than particularly concern'd to *accommodate* himself. I say, if even *they* were *mistaken*, who were to be presumed the most *Authentick* *Originals*, and who were necessarily the *only* Persons who could be *intrusted* with the faithful *Conveyance* of what *themselves* had received for the use of their *Posterity*. And indeed, I am not *Conscious* of any thing, in the *Hypothesis* now mentioned. that is not perfectly *consistent* with the *Sentiments* of that *Age* wherein the *Gospel* was
 C 3 preached

7.

*This Do-
 ctrine of
 deriving
 Immorta-
 lity from
 the Divine
 Spirit is
 perfectly a-
 greeable
 to the No-
 tions recei-
 ved by the
 Jews in
 the Apo-
 stolical
 Age.*

* *Vid. Pro-
 leg. Apo-
 log. ad D.
 Stearn. de
 Obstina-
 tione.*

The Distinction between

preached by the *Apostles*, and the *Books* of the Sacred *Canon* were written. The *Rabbins* mention their *Nephefch*, *Ruach*, and *Neshamah*, answering the three Parts in *Man* in the New Testament, of *Body*, *Soul* and *Spirit*. But I confess, I am not confident of any thing delivered by *them* as a *Tradition* so ancient as the *Apostolical* Age. But *Plato* is clear in the distinction of Νῆς or Λόγος from ψυχή, and allows it to be so great that the former could be the product of none but the *Supreme Being*, who could make nothing mortal or corruptible : and that the latter was left to the inferior *Demiurgical* Deities, who could make nothing immortal and incorruptible. So he in his *Timæus*. And it is very notorious how much that Philosophy was received in the *Apostolical* Age, even among the *Jews* themselves, and how many of their terms are alluded to, not only in *Philo* and *Josephus*, and the *Apocryphal Hellenists*, but in the *New Testament* also. The precarious fancy of *Des Cartes*, who makes every Cause of Motion distinct from Matter to be properly what we call a *Spirit*, independent on Matter, and Immortal, was not (that we know of) thought of by any ; and is therefore, at least very improper for explaining Reasonings of Times, when it was not thought True, so far they were then from Reasoning from it. And, I pray, what difference is there

there between those *Platonical* Notions, and those of the *New Testament*, but that the *Sacred Writers* more frequently call that πνεῦμα which the *Platonists* call λόγος or Νῆς? The reason of that difference is manifest, because the *Scripture* ascribes that *Superiour Power* in *Man* to a *Divine Breathing*, *Gen. ii. 7.* Yet even that very name from *breathing* is own'd by the *Heathens*, when they call the Soul, *Divinæ particulam auræ*, and the very name of *anima* or *animus* is from ἀνεμῶ. And *Seneca* uses the very word of the *New Testament* for that which he calls a *God* in *Man*, as the *Scripture* does, *Epist. 41. Philo*, as nearer to the *Apostles*, whilst they were under the prejudices of their *Jewish Education*, comes also nearer to them in this very *Expression*. He distinguishes clearly this πνεῦμα θεῖον infused by *God's Breathing*, from the *sensible formed Man*, which he makes to consist of *Body* and *Soul*, yet to be *Mortal*. His words concerning that lower part of *Man* are ;

ὁ μὲν γὰρ διαπλαθεὶς ἦδη αἰσθητὸς — ἐκ σώ- De Mund.
Op. p. 30,
31.
ματι καὶ ψυχῆς συνεσῶς, ἀνὴρ ἢ γυνή, φύσει
θνητὸς ὢν. Yet by the benefit of that πνεῦ-

μα θεῖον he owns that the more ignoble part also is made *Immortal*. He says, it was sent hither, as to a *Colony*, ἐπ' ὥρελεια τῶ γενεῖς ἡμῶν, ἵν' εἰ καὶ θνητὸν εἴη κατὰ τὴν ἀβελτὴν μερίδα, κατὰ γέν τὴν ἀβελτὴν ἀθανάτισθαι. So far the *Two Men*, the *Earthly* and the

The Distinction between

Heavenly are distinctly express'd. The *Platonists* also are as plain. They make also all *Earthly* things to have their παραδείγματα their *ιδέας*, their εἰκόνας answering them in the *Mundus vultus*, the *Intellectual Sun*, the very same with their Λόγος. And they own the same difference between them, that the *Celestial Archetypes* were supposed *Incorruptible* and *Immortal*: The *Earthly Ectypes* no otherwise than as they received their εἰκωνίς from their *Heavenly Original*, and, together with it, a participation of *Immortality* also. On the same Principles the ἀνθρώποι κατὰ μέγεθος were to receive together with their τύποις, their *Immortality* also, from the αὐτοάνθρωπος or ἄνθρωπος εἰκώδης, which they placed in the Λόγος, exactly as our *Sacred Writers* do of the *New Testament*. This gives a clear account how all *Humane Immortality* must be derived from our *Blessed Lord*, as the Λόγος; and that *none* can pretend to it, who cannot shew their title to it, by their title to *Him*, as our

Alleg. 1. 1. New Testament Writers suppose. *Philo* owns the same distinction of the *Two Men* elsewhere. That is not all. He, as conversant in the *Scripture*, owns the very name of *Adam* as common to both these *Men*. And what does the *Apostle* more, excepting his application of it to our *Christ*, whom *Philo*, as a *Jew*, did not acknowledge, either to be the *Christ*, or the Λόγος? How-

Alleg. 1. 1.
P. 49, 50.
56, 57, &c.

However, by this *Philosophical Hypothesis*, it was from the Λόγος that these exiled minds, φυγάδες θεόθεν ἢ ἀλήται, were supposed to fall. And it was accordingly thought the Office of the same Λόγος, to restore them to their former dignity, by restoring that *Diviner Principle* to which they had been entitled, as *Descendents* from Adam, if Adam had not disabled himself for deriving it to them by losing it himself. This Λόγος or Νῆς, was taken by Plato for the *Wing* of the Soul, which enabled it to mount above the *subcelestial* Regions to Heaven, which whatsoever Soul wanted, it was thereby disabled to recover its former Station. And it was taken for the Office of the Λόγος to send down those new *Coloni*, as Philo calls them, which added to well disposed Souls, might enable them to recover Heaven from whence they were supposed to have fallen. This was therefore taken for a *Divine Nature* (as S. Peter himself calls it, 2 Ep. i. 4) as it made them *Immortal*, and as it raised them to the place of the Gods in the lower sense of the Word. So those Gods are described by their Worshipers, that their dwelling is not with flesh, Dan. ii. 11. And by Homer, That they are Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες. And the Λόγος was then to take care of sending down this *Celestial Colony*, when he was to undertake the πηδάλιον (that is Plato's Word) the Helm

Helm of the *World* in his own Person, which was supposed to be at the beginning of the *Golden Age*. This is therefore the *Nova Progenies* from *Heaven*, in *Virgil*, *Eclog.* 3. And the sending down these, is the reason why the *Gods* were supposed to be so familiar with *Men* in the *Golden Age*, because the *Men* then living were supposed then generally to have enjoyed this *Divine Spirit*. On this account it is that *S. Paul* quotes the *Heathen Poet Aratus* with Approbation: Τὸ γὰρ ἡ γένεσις ἐσμέν. For so it follows immediately: Γένεσις ἐν ὑπαρχούσις τὸ θεῷ, &c. He Reasons upon it, not only as granted by those with whom he was then disputing, but as really *True*.

8. Thus then it appears that this *Divine Spirit* entitled them who had it to a state of *Immortality*, in the opinion of those Times, at least of Rewards. Yet even this *Divine Seed* was thought to be τέλει φύσεως, and such as might, by the ill use of their *Free-Will*, not only deserve, but incur Punishment. And in that Case, if the *Punishment* was not limited to a certain time, it might be equal to their own duration, and therefore *Eternal* also. So it was supposed to be in the Case of *Saturn*. So in the Case of the *Titans*, and the *Rebel Giants*, condemned for their Wars against the *Gods*, when all were thought to be *Gods* on account of their *Divine Extraction*, So, in relation to

It is also agreeable to those Heathen Originals from whence the Phrases of the N. T. concerning this matter are deriv'd.

to the Jewish Hellenists, in the Case of the Giants, which were born to the Sons of God by the Daughters of Men, and of these Sons of God themselves, who are called Angels by S. Jude, who are said to have left their own δεινότητων, and to have fallen from their ἀρχή, the Dignity wherein they had been created, and are reckoned among *Fleshly Sinners*. So also in the Case of the first fallen Angel who tempted our first Parents long before that Defection that occasioned the Deluge. These were all *Pneumatical*, either *unmixt* as the Angels; or *mixt* as the Giants, who answered the Heathen Heroes or Semidei, being Divine, as they descended from the Sons of Seth, and purely Humane, as being born by the Daughters of Cain, who had no pretensions to this Divine Spirit. These are the Spirits in Prison, 1 S. Pet. iii. 19. As being in Prison, is the same with being bound, Act. xxiii. 18. xxv. 14. xxvi. 29. So the Apostate Angels are said to be bound in the Book of Tobit and S. Peter, and the Apocryphal Book of Enoch and the Revelations. And that in Chains of Darknes. In them they are said to be reserved to the Judgment of the Great Day. The Book of Enoch seems also here alluded to, as also the Heathen Traditions of Saturn's being also bound, mention'd in Plutarch. The Book of Enoch mentions a Day wherein they were to be judged.

Judged. Then they are to be sentenced to *Fire*, to *Flaming* and *Eternal Fire*, to *Tartarus*, that *nethermost Hell*, the *deepest* part of *Hades*, as it is described in *Hesiod*, from whom, and the like *Heathen Poets*, the Word is taken in the *New Testament*. This was the place for *Immortal Criminals*, and never mention'd as *intended* for *Ordinary Souls* in the *Poets*, from whose use the Word is taken. And the *New Testament* implies it, when it tells us that it was *prepared* for the *Devil* and his *Angels*, who were all undoubtedly owned for *Spiritual*. That ordinary *Humane Souls* should be *Spiritualized*, and should be thereby entitled to *Eternal Punishments*, was a thing *unknown* before ; and was first notified by the *Revelations* of the *Gospel*. These *New Revelations* therefore declared that *God* had *appointed* that *Day*, which before they only thought *probable* by *Humane Reasonings* : and that all that *heard* the *Gospel* should be *concerned* in it, which none but those *Fallen Angels*, and the *Giants* their *Offspring*, were thought concern'd in before ; and that they who were understood to have taken the *Devil's* part, by *not* joyning with our *Blessed Lord*, upon the *publication* of his *Pleasure*, requiring them to joyn *Him*, should be so far *Spiritualized* as was requisite to entitle them to *Immortal Punishments*, should share in those *Punishments* which were *not* prepared for

for them, but for the *Devil* and his *Angels*, to whom they had joyned *themselves* in *opposition* to our *Lord*; and that our *Blessed Lord*, whom they had provoked by *joyning* with his *Adversary*, was by *God* himself appointed to be the *Judge* that should pass the Sentence, as well against his *Capital Enemies*, as their *Accomplices*. Hence it is that our *Blessed Saviour* himself, in his Parable concerning his own *Marriage* with his *Church*, sentences those who should come to it without the *Wedding Garment*, to be *bound hand and foot*, and *cast into outer darkness*, where there should be *weeping and gnashing of teeth*, S. *Matth.* xxii. 13. This seems plainly to intimate their sharing with those *Devils* in their *Punishment*, whose part they had espoused, by *rejecting* the *Gospel* when it was *preached* to them. The *binding* seems to be design'd in order to it. They are *bound* as the *Devils* were. And with the same *design* of *casting* them into the *Fire*, prepared for the *Devils*, as the Three Children were *bound* when they were cast into the *Fiery Furnace*. They are therefore said to be *chained*, to shew the *Confinement* of these *Spiritual* Natures from that Freedom which their *own* Nature would allow them, if they had been left to it, and had *not* been *chained*. And the *Chains* are called *Chains of Darkness*, to let us know that it was to the *darkness* of those *Sublunary* Regions,

The Distinction between

gions in opposition to the *Light* of those that are *Celestial*, to which they are opposed in *Scripture*. These *Chains* therefore suppose these Beings so *chained* to have a *Heavenly* and *Divine* Ingredient in their *Natural* Constitution, which would have enabled them to aspire to the *Heavenly* Regions of *Light*, if they had not been *confined* to those *darker* Regions by those *Chains*. Yet even these *Chains* do *not* confine them to the *Tartarus*, for which they were reserved. When our Saviour was dispossessing him who had the *Legion*, the *Devils* tell him of *tormenting* them *before* their *Time*, S. *Matth.* viii. 29. What they meant by that, is explain'd in the same Narrative by S. *Luke*, that it was, his sending them into the *Abyss*, S. *Luke* viii. 31. That *Abyss* is the same mention'd in *Genes.* i. 2. where *Darkness* is said to be on the face of the *Abyss*. So in the LXXII, and the Vulgar *Latin*. So it answers the Poets *Chaos*, as that also includes *Tartarus*, as well as others of the *infernal* Regions. And here it seems to be the *outer darkness*, that has *another darkness* upon the *face* of it. And so the *Gnosticks* seem to have understood it in their *Fragments*, at the end of *Clemens Alexandrinus*. This plainly supposes them not yet in that *darkness* which is designed for their *Punishment* till the *time* appointed for it, the *Day* of *Judgment*. Their *present*
place

place therefore is the *Darkness* that is nearest the *Heavens*, the Regions of *Light*. That therefore it is taken for a *Confinement* for them to be here, it shews that Heaven was the ἰδίον οἰκητήριον from which they fell, and the place proper for their *Spiritual Nature*. And this the Scripture acknowledges when it stiles them πνεύματα, though it is usually with the Epithet of ἀνάθετα. When therefore *Humane Souls* are made ἱσάγγελοι by the Addition of this *adscititious Spirit*, they are then qualified for this higher degree of *Punishment*. And being so qualified, *Christ* judges it fit, that they should share with them in it, having joined with them in their common Rebellion against his Authority. But this could only concern those Souls, whose Nature had been exalted and improved by the Accession of this *adscititious Spirit*. Others were not ἱσάγγελοι in Nature, and therefore not so qualified to share in the *Punishment* of lapsed Angels. Thus it appears to me, that this Hypothesis is really more *Scriptural*, than any other advanced in Opposition to it, from the Consent of modern Ages.

But you oppose to it the *Principles*, you are pleased to call *Catholick*, of the Souls *Immortality*. And I am very willing to be concluded by any *Principles* truly *Catholick*; yet I shall not confine you to that
Notion

9.
 This Doctrine is owned by S. Justin Martyr.

The Distinction between

Notion of Catholick, which belongs properly to the *Archetypal Church in Heaven*, as I think I have proved in my *Parænesis*. I am content with that *Consent of particular Churches*, which may be a solid *Argument* for proving a *Doctrine delivered from the Apostles*. But I must needs say, I do not think that the *Consent of all*, or the *greatest part*, of *particular Churches now*, at this *distance* we live in, from the *Apostles*, is such an *Argument*. The *Protestants* took many *Doctrines* as they *found* them, without examining them from *Originals*, when no *use* of them in the *Controversies then* disputed, suggested any *Reasons* for *distrusting* them. The two great *Bodies* of the *Greeks* and the *Romanists* had for many of the *intermediate Ages*, allowed *new Revelations* since the *Apostles* times, and *new Credentials of Miracles*, for recommending them ; and had agreed on so *precarious Proofs* of both kinds, as put it perfectly in their *Power* to introduce what *new Revelations* they pleased of *Doctrines unknown* to the *Apostles*, and to make their *own Bodies unanimous* in them, by *Principles* received by *both* of them, and *not* concerned in their *Differences in Communion* from each other. Their *Agreement* therefore in any *Doctrine*, as received from the *Apostles*, can be no certain *Argument* to prove that it *really* was so, at least, since the *time* they

they have taken up, and agreed in, these *false Criteria*. If we allow of no *new Doctrinal Revelations*, but what were made to the *Apostles*, we can allow of no *Consent* of particular Churches, as an *Argument* to prove a *Doctrine* true, but such a *Consent* as could not possibly have been, unless the *Doctrine* had been *really* revealed to the *Apostles*, and been faithfully conveyed from them. This I am willing to be determined by as it is managed by *Tertullian* and *Vincentius Lirinensis*, but especially by *Tertullian*. The nearer the better, and the more impossible it was for *Bishops* to have been *unanimous* in a *Change* when they were equal, and none had Authority sufficient to oblige his *Colleagues* to change with him. Yet even here also I confess them *unanimous* in asserting the *actual* Survival of *Souls*, after the Dissolution of their Bodies. All I deny is, that they asserted them *Immortal* of its own nature, or that their continued Survival was for ever, without a new *Indulgence* of God, above what he had granted them at their *Creation*. Against this I oppose S. *Justin Martyr*. His good old Man, or *Genius* (in whose person he speaks what himself believes true) blames *Plato* expressly, for asserting your *Doctrine* of the *Soul's natural Immortality*. He tells us expressly, in opposition to him; Οὐδὲ μὲν ἀθάνατον ἔχει λέγειν αὐτῷ. *Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 222.*

D

He

The Distinction between

He gives this plain account of God's disposal of *Human Souls*: Αἱ μὲν ἄξια τῷ θεῷ φα-
νεῖσθαι ἐκ ἀποθνήσκουσιν ἐπὶ αἱ δὲ κολάζονται
ἐς' ἃν αὐτὰς καὶ ΕἶΝΑΙ καὶ κολάζεσθαι ὁ θεὸς
δέλγ. p. 223. He makes their *Existence*,
as well as the *Duration* of their *Punishment*,
to depend on the *Divine* arbitrary *Pleasure*.
So that the *Eternity* of the *Punishment* of
the *Wicked* themselves, how much soever
contrary to their own *Desires*, is not (ac-
cording to him) imputable to their *Nature*,
but God's Will that it should be so *actually*.
So he had told us just before: Ἀλλὰ μὴν
ἐδὲ ἀποθνήσκειν φημι πάσας τὰς ψυχὰς ἐγὼ
ἔρμαιον γὰρ ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς τοῖς κακοῖς. Plainly
implying, that though all *Souls* did *not*,
yet *some* did *actually* die, even according to
his *own* Opinion, which must therefore
have been exactly the *same* with that you
think so hardly of. He accordingly applies
what *Plato* in his *Timæus* says concerning
the *World*, to this case of *Human Souls*,
and all *other* Beings distinct from God him-
self: Ὅτι αὐτὸς μὲν καὶ φθαλὸς ἐστὶν ἢ γέγονεν,
καὶ λυθήσεται δὲ, ἐδὲ τεύξεσθαι θανάτου μοίρας,
διὰ τὸ βέλησθαι τῷ θεῷ; τίτ' αὐτὸ σοὶ δοκεῖ καὶ
περὶ ΨΥΧΗΣ καὶ ἀπλῶς πάντων περὶ
λέγεσθαι; ὅσα γὰρ ὅτι μετὰ τὸ θεόν, ἢ ἐστὶ
πολλὰ, ταῦτα φύσιν φθαλῶν ἔχειν, καὶ οἷα τε ἐξ-
αφανισθῆναι καὶ μὴ εἶναι ἐπὶ. Μόνος γὰρ ἀγέ-
νητος καὶ ἀφθαρτος ὁ θεός, καὶ διὰ τούτου θεός ὅτι
τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα μετὰ τούτον γεννητὰ καὶ φθαλὰ.
Τέτε

Τέττε χάριν ἢ ἈΠΟΘΝΗ' ΣΚΟΥΣ ΙΝ
 ΑΙ' ΨΥΧΑΙ' ἢ κολάζονται. It is particu-
 lar, with regard to *Human Souls*, that the
Mortality he ascribes to them, is such as is
 not generally prevented by God himself; but
 may actually take place in those Cases
 wherein the contrary Doctrine is of the
 harshest Consequence, that of unbaptized In-
 fants, and of those who never heard of the
 Gospel. And this *Mortality* is not meant
 mystically, in reference to the Enjoyment of
 God; but literally, as appears from the
 Places now transcribed, of a ceasing to be.
 He applies it expressly to their Being. And
 it is their ceasing to be, that he owns to be
 so beneficial to the wicked, as the Scripture
 does also. So again; Ζωὴς ὃ ψυχὴ μετέχει,
 ἐπεὶ ζῆν αὐτὴν ὁ Θεὸς βόλεται· ἔτιωσ ἄρα ἢ ἔ
 μεθέξει πολλὲ, ὅταν αὐτὴν μὴ θέλοι ζῆν. p. 224.
 That is not all, He ascribes this Death of
 the Soul to the same Cause as I have done,
 from S. Paul, the Desertion of it by the
 Spirit. So it follows afterwards: As the
 Man dies when the Soul leaves the Body;
 ἔτιωσ ἢ ὅταν δέη τὴν ψυχὴν μὴκέτι ΕἶΝΑΙ,
 ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτῆς τὸ ΖΩΤΙΚΟΝ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ,
 ἢ ἐν ἔσῳ ἢ ψυχὴ ἔτι, ἀλλὰ ἢ αὐτὴ ἔθαν ἐλή-
 φθη, ἐκείσε χωρεῖ πάλιν. This ζῶνικόν πνεῦμα
 is the very same, and has the very same
 Effects ascribed to it, as the πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν
 in S. Paul. So S. Justin.

The Distinction between

II.
And by
Tatian.

The same also is the Doctrine of his Disciple *Tatian*, a little after his Master's *Martyrdom*. His words are as plain to this purpose, as those of his glorious Master ;

ἐκ ἑσιν ἀθάνατοι, ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες, ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ ἑαυτὴν, θνήσκῃ δέ. Ἀλλὰ δύναται ἡ αὐτὴ καὶ μὴ ἀποθνήσκειν. Θνήσκει μὲν γὰρ καὶ λυεταί μετὰ τῷ σώματι, μὴ γινώσκουσα τὸ ἀληθεῖαν, ἀνίσταται δὲ εἰς ὕψερρον ὅπῃ συνιλεῖται τῷ κόσμῳ σὺν τῷ σώματι θανάτιον διὰ τιμωρίας ἐν ἀθανασίᾳ λαμβάνουσα. Πάλιν τε ὁ θνήσκει, καὶ πρὸς καρπὸν λυθῇ, τὸ ὁπίγνωσιν τῷ Θεῷ πεποιημένη. Orat. ad Græc. § 21. Ed. Oxon.

Withal he owns it due to the Spirit, that it does not actually die. So afterwards :

Ψυχὴ γὰρ ἐκ αὐτῇ τὸ πνεῦμα ἔσωσεν, ἐσώθη δὲ ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς. § 22. Again : συζυγίαν δὲ κακ-

τημένην τὸ τῷ Θεῷ πνεύματος, ἐκ ἑσιν ἀβόητος. Ἀνέρχεται δὲ πρὸς ἅπας αὐτὴν ὁδηγεῖ χωρὶς τὸ πνεῦμα. Τῷ μὲν γὰρ ὅστιν ἄνω τὸ οἰκηθῆριον. The σωτήρια is from ὕλη,

the *World* ; and the οἰκηθῆριον above is the same mentioned by S. *Jude*, as lost by the fallen *Angels*. He makes the *Desertion* of the *Spirit* the *Cause* of this *Death* : Πτέρωσις γὰρ ἡ τῇ ψυχῇ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ τέλειον ὅπερ ἀπορρίψασα, διὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἐπὶ ὥσπερ νεοσσὸς καὶ γὰρ χαμαιπετής ἐγένετο. §. 34. The *Language* here is that of *Plato* He therefore makes it the *Duty* of those who would recover the *Conjunction* with *God*, which *Mankind* has lost (for he had owned the

first Man to have had it, §. 22.) to retrieve this Union with the Spirit ; *χρὴ λοιπὸν ἐμᾶς ὅπερ ἔχοντες ἀπολωλέκαμεν, τὸτο νῦν ἀναζητῆν, ζευγῶναί τε τῇ ψυχῇ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ, ἢ τῇ κατὰ θεὸν συζυγίαν πραγματοῦναι.* § 24. And, as he ascribes our Salvation to this Communion with the Divine Spirit, so, on the contrary, he makes this κοινωνία with the Devil to entitle them, who are guilty of that κοινωνία, to share with the Devils in their Punishment. His words are ; *Καθάπερ ὃ τῷ ληστῶνι συνδειπνήσας, καὶ μὴ ληστὴς αὐτὸς ἦ, ἀλλ' ὁμῶς, διὰ τὸ συνεσθῆναι, τιμωρίας μετ' αὐτὸν λαμβάνει τῷ αὐτῷ ἢ ὁ μὴ κακός. τῷ ὃ φάτω ἀναμνηεῖς, πρὸς τὸ νομιζόμενον κακὸν συγχριστάμενος, διὰ τῷ εἰς αὐτὸν κοινωνίαν, ὑπὸ τῷ κρίνῳ τὸτον θεὸς κολαδιέται.* § 20. Thus far he agrees with his Master, and may therefore be more securely trusted, as a faithful Witness of what was not contradictory to Apostolical Tradition. His making the Souls, both of the Good and Evil, die, in the interval between the Death of their Bodies and their Resurrection, we may look on as his Human Reasonings, when he was now disposed to introduce his Heresie, which he did soon after his Master's Death. But then he had less regard for truly Apostolical Tradition, and the true Catholick Church as a Witness of it.

12.
And St.
Irenæus.

S. Irenæus follows S. Justin Martyr, after whom he wrote, tho' he was born before him. He admits the Reasoning that S. Justin did, that whatever was γεννῆτον, must be φθαρτὸν ; And therefore allows nothing to be ingenerable and incorruptible, but God. All other things therefore having had a beginning, he allows them no certain Duration, but according to the Pleasure of God : *Perseverant autem, & extenduntur ad longitudinem Saculorum ; secundum voluntatem factoris Dei*, l. i. c. 62. The Words are taken from the famous Passage of Plato in his *Timaus*, where the Perpetuity of Duration is expressly denied to them, on account of their Nature. He applies it to Souls and created Spirits themselves. And therefore adds concerning them also ; *Perseverant autem quoadusque, eas Deus & esse & perseverare voluerit*. So, concerning our Life, he affirms ; *Non enim ex nobis, neque ex nostrâ Naturâ vita est, sed secundum gratiam Dei datur*. He therefore subjoins, that he who is ingrateful and owns not his Benefactor, *ipse se privat in sæculum sæculi perseverantia*. Afterwards he has these Words ; *Capit & animas primum non existentes dehinc perseverare, cum eas Deus & esse & subsistere voluerit*. He uses the Reasonings, and almost the Words, of S. Justin. Though the Reasoning is Plato's, and he may seem to proceed on the

the *Platonick* Hypothesis, in those very Particulars wherein S. *Justin* owns himself of a *different* Opinion from *Plato*. He may seem to reckon the *Souls* and *Spirits* in *one* Rank, as if the *Soul's* actual *Immortality* were no more *precarious*, than that of the *Spirit*, which is directly *contrary* to the Doctrine of S. *Justin*. He seems to make *them* also *naturâ immortalia*, quibus à suâ naturâ adest vivere, l. v. c. 4. He denies that the *Soul* dies, l. v. c. 7. But it is upon a *critical* Notion of *Death*, as it signifies a ceasing to *breath*, which cannot properly belong to any thing but the *Body* which is, *alone*, that which properly *breaths*. Again, v. 13. Οὐτε γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ θνήσκει, ἕτα τὸ πνεῦμα. But all he *means* by these Expressions, seems only to be, that the *Soul* does not *actually* die when the *Body* dies, and that, in its own *Nature*, it does not consist of *contrary Principles*, tending to a *Dissolution* by its own *Nature*, as the *Body* does. So he will not differ from S. *Justin*, but *Tatian*, as *denying* the *actual Death*, even of the *Soul*, though *Death* be indeed *natural* to it on account of its *natural Constitution*. And so himself seems to explain himself, when, speaking of this *Immortality* of the *Soul* and *Spirit*, he has these Words; *per-severant immortalia*, quoniam vivificantur à patre, l. v. c. 4. It is therefore the *perseverance* in *Life*, when the *Body* dies, that

The Distinction between

he means by the *Soul's Immortality*. And it is the extrinſical *Favour* of the *Father*, not its own *Nature*, to which the *Soul* is beholden for that *perſeverance in Being*, according to the Opinion of *St. Irenæus*. But a *perfect Man*, according to him, as well as the *Apoſtle*, includes all Three: *Perfectus homo commixtio & adunitio eſt animæ aſſumentis Spiritum Patris, & admixta ei carni, quæ eſt plasmata ſecundum imaginem Dei, v. 6.* Again: *Cum autem Spiritus hic commixtus animæ unitur plasmati, propter eſſuſionem Spiritûs Spiritualis & perfectus homo factus eſt; & hic eſt qui ſecundum imaginem & ſimilitudinem factus eſt Dei.* And more he has in the ſame Place, to the ſame Purpoſe. As after c. 8. All three are, with him, eſſential to the *ſpiritual Man*, who is qualified to be a *Member* of the new *Peculium*, whether he have extraordinary Gifts of the *Spirit* or not: He cannot otherwiſe be one *Spirit*, as well as one *Body*, with *Chriſt Myſtical*. Indeed, if he have not the *Spirit* of *Chriſt*, he can be none of his. But he does not believe all *Men* to have this *Spirit*. His Words are; *Si autem deſuerit animæ Spiritus, Animalis eſt verè, qui eſt talis, & carnalis deſelectus imperfectus erit; imaginem quidem habens in plasmate, ſimilitudinem verò non aſſumens per Spiritum, v. 6.* Nor did he believe that, without this *Spirit*, they could have *Spiritual Bodies*, which might

might entitle them to *Immortality*, and the *Resurrection*. So afterwards; *Per Spiritum surgentia fiunt corpora Spiritualia, uti per Spiritum semper permanentem habeant vitam*, v. 7. Again; *Sic ergo pignus hoc habitans in nobis jam Spirituales efficit, & absorbetur mortale ab immortalitate*, c. 8, 9. It is endless to transcribe all his Places to this Purpose. His xii. Chap. is very considerable. He there makes a *Distinction* between the πνοὴ ζωῆς and the πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν in the Greek of *Genesis*. The πνοὴ ζωῆς, he says, makes a Man only ψυχικόν. For this *Flatus vitæ*, is with him the *anima* or ψυχή c. 7. This is all that he owns as given to all *Mankind*. So he observes from *Is. xlii. 5.* τὸ μὲν πνοὴν παντὶ κοινῶς τῷ ἔθνει ζωῆς λαφύειν δέδοται τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἰδίως καταπαύσει τὰς γὰρ ἐπιθυμίας. This seems plainly to allude to the *Renunciation* of the *Lusts* of the *Flesh*, made in our *Christian Baptism*. Plainly therefore he does not allow all *Mankind* that *Principle* which can alone, in his Opinion, entitle them to the *Immortality* of their *Bodies*, and the *Resurrection*. Yet its being given as a *vital Principle* of the *new Life*, in our *Baptismal Regeneration* to that *new Life*, for our *Qualification* for *Immortal Rewards*, is very reconcilable with its *qualifying* those for *Punishments*, who have it in their *Power* to *qualifie themselves* for *eternal Rewards*,
if

The Distinction between

if themselves *pleased*. God's *Pleasure*, is here alledged as the *Reason* why those Beings may be *perpetuated*, which, of their own *Nature*, can lay no claim to a *Perpetuity* of Duration. And it is again perfectly depending on his *Pleasure*, which way he will *perpetuate* them to *Punishment*; who, through their own *Fault*, have never received the *Baptismal Immortalizing Spirit*. He may assign them a *Spirit* that may *only immortalize them*. Or he may himself, if he pleases, *perpetuate* their Duration, without any subordinate Influence of any *Spirit* at all.

13.
And Athenagoras.

So also *Athenagoras* in his excellent Discourse concerning the *Resurrection*: 'Ο ὁ
 ἡ νῦν ἡ λόγον δεξάμεθα, ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπου. ἔ
 ψυχὴ κατ' ἐαυτὴν. Ἀνθρώποι ἄρα δεῖ τ' ἐξ
 ἀμφοτέρων ὄντα διαμένειν εἰς αἰὶ. Here are
 all the *three* Parts already mentioned as requisite to the *Perfect Man* that may διαμένειν
 εἰς αἰὶ. Only the *Supreme* and *Noblest* part of all, which the *Scripture* calls πνεῦμα, is here expressed in terms more received among the *Heathen Philosophers*, to whom the Author writes, of Νῆς and Λόγος. Both of them may be applied to the same thing in different respects, only Νῆς is the *nobler* Appellation of the *Two*. The *Humane Spirit* is Λόγος, with relation to the *Diviner Spirit*, that is, the *Third Person* in the *Trinity*. Yet it is Νῆς if compared with the

Hu-

Humane Soul. And it is plainly *contradistinguished* from the ψυχὴ καὶ ἐν τῷ, as that which cannot make a *Man* with the *Soul* alone, without the *Body*. This seems to allude to its title of the *Second Adam*, the *Man* from *Heaven*, which may denominate a σῶμα πνευματικὸν that may be entitled to *Immortality* and the *Resurrection*. It therefore supposes a σῶμα ψυχικὸν, because it is not *another Body*, but the *same changed* (that is the *Apostles* word) and, by the *change* ennobled and exalted to a *more excellent State*, from that of being *Corruptible* to *Incorruption*, and of being *Mortal* to *Immortality*. This must have been this admirable Author's design, in order to prove the *Resurrection* of the *Body*. None, that I know, ever pretended that *Soul*, which is *common* to all *Mankind*, to be a *one* sufficient for *immortalizing* the *Body*. But it was the *received Opinion* among *Christians*, that the πνεῦμα or λόγος, as derived from *Christ* the *fontal λόγος*, added not to the ψυχὴ alone, but to the σῶμα ψυχικὸν, was sufficient for it, to *change our vile Bodies*, and to *make them like his glorious Body*, from *whom*, all *Men* (who could pretend a good Title) were, (by the *Apostle's Reasoning*) to *derive* their Title to the *Resurrection*. At least this λόγος is to give us a *Title* to have our *Bodies* raised by *Christ*, as this makes us *one Spirit* with him,
and

The Distinction between

and consequently gives him a *Title* to our *Bodies* as *animated* by his *Spirit*. He likewise proceeds on the same Principles in his *Legation*. He there gives an account of the *fall* of the *Angels* by *Women*. So the *Greek* Interpreters call the *Sons* of *Seth*, *Gen. vi.* He tells us therefore that these *Angels* fell from *Heaven*, *περὶ τὰ ἀέρα ἔχοντες καὶ τὴν γῆν, ἐκέτι εἰς τὰ ὑπερσράνια ὑπερκύβαι δυνάμενοι*, This is agreeable to what I have observed in my Discourse of *Marriages* according to the *Notions* of those *Times*. They being of a *Pneumatical* Original have therefore the *next* place to *Heaven* allowed them, when their *forfeiture* of the *Spirit*, and the *ὑπερσφύσησις* following upon it (to speak in the Language of the *Platonists*) had *disabled* them for *mounting* thither again. But the *Souls* of the *Giants*, born of the *Daughters* of *Men*, he says, are *οἱ περὶ κόσμον πλανώμενοι δαίμονες*, the *ἀστέρες πλανῆται*, the *Authors* of *πλάνη*, that go to and fro in the *Earth*, in the style of the *Scriptures*, *πάντη φοιτῶντες ἐπ' αἰῶν*, in that of *Hesiod*. These are on the *Earth*, and yet lower than the fallen *Angels*, as being of a *mixt* Nature: *Spiritual*, as being by their *Fathers* descended from *Seth*, and yet *Psychical* only as descended from the *Daughters* of *Cain*, who never had any pretensions to the *Spirit*.

14.
And Theophilus Antiochenus.

Theophilus Antiochenus reckons *Man* as neither *Mortal* nor *Immortal* of his own Nature,

ture, but capable of either state according to his own behaviour. His words are, Μέσος γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐφερόναι, ἕτε δινητὸς ὁ λογιζόμενος, ἕτε ἀθάνατος τὸ καθόλου, δεκτικὸς ὅ ἑκατέρων, *L. ii. ad Antolyc. p. 101.* Again, Ἀλλὰ φησὶ ἐν τῇς ἡμῖν, δινητὸς φύσει ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος, Οὐδαμῶς. Τι ἐν, ἀθάνατος; Οὐδὲ τῷτο φάμεν· ἀλλὰ ἐρεῖ τις, ἐδὲν ἐν ἐγένετο, ἐδὲ τῷτο; ἐγὼ μὲν. [Perhaps ἐγῶμαι for ἐγὼ διμαι in the stile of *Dialogues*] Οὐτε ἐν φύσει δινητὸς ἐγένετο, ἕτε ἀθάνατος. Εἰ γὰρ ἀθάνατον αὐτὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐπεποιήκει, θεὸν ἂν ἐπεποιήκει· πάλιν εἰ δινητὸν αὐτὸν πεποιήκει, ἐδόκει ἂν ὁ θεὸς αἰτιᾶν ἢ τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ. Οὐτε ἐν ἀθανάτῳ αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν, ἕτε μὴν δινητὸν, ἀλλὰ, καθὼς περιήραμεν, δεκτικὸν ἀμφοτέρων· ἵνα ῥέψῃ ἐπὶ τὰ τ' ἀθανασίας, τηρήσας τὴν ἐντολὴν τῷ θεῷ, μισθὸν κομισῆται παρ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀθανασίαν, καὶ γένηται θεός· εἰ δ' αὖ τραπῇ ἐπὶ τὰ τῷ θανάτῳ πράγματα, παρακίσει τῷ θεῷ, αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ αἰτιᾶν ἢ τῷ θανάτῳ. I have mended the Pointings for clearing the Sense. God's *not* being the Author of *Death* is from *Wisd. i. 12, 13.* as appears from the word ἐπεσπάσατο used by him a little after, which is the very word of that *Apocryphal* Author. Our Promotion to a *Divine Nature* is likewise probably derived from *Gen. iii. 22.* But it is warranted by the *New Testament*, and by other *Authorities* of the *best* and *purest* *Ages*, as I have long since shewn in my *Prolegom.* to my

The Distinction between

my Tutor's Book *de Obſtinatione*. Accordingly his *Hypotheſis* is, That even *Corporal Death* was not deſigned for *Mankind* by God, any more than *Corporal Immortality*. That *Corporal Death* was not deſigned, he takes for granted from that place of *Wiſdom*. That *Corporal Immortality* was not deſigned, he proves, becauſe God did not at firſt make *Man a God*. Meaning that lower notion of God which was conſiſtent with his being made a God, ſuppoſing however that even this lower Notion of being a God would have been ſufficient to have ſecured him from actual Mortality from which the Nature of that *Human Soul*, without the adſcitiſious Divinity would not ſecure him. Otherwiſe God's making him no more than a *Man* would have determin'd him to be *Immortal*, contrary to the certain ſenſe of this very ancient Author. This Reasoning therefore plainly ſuppoſes the *Human Soul* alone not ſufficient for *Immortality* without the acceſſion of this nobler *Divine Principle*; and that in conjunction with it, all three together are ſufficient: ſo that if God had made them all ingredient in the Nature of *Mankind*, he muſt have made it neceſſarily *Immortal*. And both theſe particulars are not only neceſſary Conſequences from his Reasoning, but perfectly agreeable to his Opinion. He had before obſerved the Sacred Writers words concerning the Formation of *Man*, that God
breathed

breathed into him *πνοὴν ζωῆς* καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἀν-
 θρωπῶς εἰς ψυχὴν ζωσαν. Ὅθεν (says he)
 καὶ ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχὴ ὠνόμασαι παρὰ τοῖς
 πλείοσι. Implying plainly that he was
 not himself of the number of the *many* who
 thought so. That appears from what I have
 now said for him, and what I have said
 concerning the distinction of this *πνοὴ* ὁ
ζωῆς from the *πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν*, which was
 taken for the true *Principle of Immortality*,
 from S. Irenæus. I cannot therefore easily
 believe that they were *Christians* who were
 meant by the *πλείονες* here mention'd. But
 who then (may you say) could they be
 that proved the *Immortality* of the Soul from
Scripture? Perhaps the *Jewish Pharisees*,
 who were the most *Popular Sect* among the
Jews, and who defended the Being, not on-
 ly of *Angels*, but of *πνεύματα* distinct from
Angels, *Act. xxiii. 8*. Yet not so Critical as
 to distinguish between the *πνοὴ* and the
πνεῦμα, as S. Irenæus was, when they rea-
 soned from the *πνεῦμα* to the *πνοή*. Yet
 they might, at *this time*, have been *Hea-
 then Philosophers*, who, from the time of
Numenius and *Cronius*, and so downwards,
 admitted of the *Jewish Hypothesis* as con-
 siderable in the *Elective Sect* of *Philosophy*
 then prevailing, which did not confine it
 self to any one received Sect, nor even to
 the general consent of their *Heathen Masters*.
 And considering the *Adversaries* with whom
 our

our Author deals in this *Work*, this may indeed be the more *likely* Opinion. But, for the way how *Man* was to attain the *Divine Principle* that was to make him a *God*, and, in consequence thereof, give him a title to *Immortality*, and the *Resurrection* of his *Body* also; he thus describes it. Μετέθηκεν ὁ αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ἐξ ἧς ἐκέρχεται, εἰς τὴν παράδεισον, διδὼς αὐτῷ ἀρογμὴν περισκοπῆς, ὕψους, αὐξάνων, καὶ τέλει. γενόμενος, ἐπὶ ὃ καὶ Θεὸς ἀναδειχθεὶς, ἔτι καὶ εἰς τὴν ἑρανὸν ἀναβῆναι. Here it is plain, that (by *his Principles*) the title to *Immortality*, and to *ascend* into *Heaven*, could not otherwise be expected but by his *αὐξήσις*, his *Improvement* beyond what he had received at his first *Creation*, which yet was *all* that his *Posterity* could claim from *him*, as bearing *his εἰκὼν*, and descending from *him*. And what that *Improvement* was, we may easily understand by the word he uses concerning it, of being τέλειος. That may indeed imply *maturity* of *Age* in him who represents *Adam* as a *Child* at his first *Creation*. But they did not own any *Proficiency* in *Gods*, even in their *Gods* who were owned to have a *beginning*. *Cupid* and *Mercury*, in the *Heathen* Mythologies, are made to perform the Office of *Adults* as soon as ever they were *born*. The *perfect Man* therefore here is the same that is called so by *S. Paul* and *S. Irenæus*, and the other *Fa-*
thers

thers of this Age, who is made so by the addition of the Spirit to the other constituents of Man at his first Creation, common to all who partake of the same Humane Nature. This was taken for the ultimate complement of the perfect Man, as that which made him perfect, as the Divine Nature which made him (in the stile of Theophilus) a God, and therefore entitled him to Immortality, and the Heavenly οὐρανίου. To this purpose he has another subtle Mystical Observation on the passage of Genesis : Ἐν τῇ Γενέσει γέγραπται ὡς δὲ αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ Παραδείσῳ τεθέντα ἵνα τὸ μὲν ἀπαξ ἢ πεπληρωμένον ποτὲ ἐτέθη τὸ δὲ δεύτερον μέλλει πληροῦσθαι μετὰ τῷ ἀνάστασιν καὶ κρίσειν. Paradise, with the Mystical Interpreters, (and according to the design of God himself, as he was pleased to signify his mind by Mystical Symbols) was taken for a Symbol of Heaven. Accordingly the placing the Man in Paradise signified the conferring on him a Title to Heaven. These Mystical Expositors therefore make the Man, who was made of the dust of the Earth, not to have been made in Paradise, but in that Earth out of the dust of which he was made. And that purposely, with this design, that God might thereby signify, that Man had no title to Immortality and Heaven, barely on account of the Humane Nature he had received at his first Creation,

E

and

and which was to be *transmitted* by him to his *Posterity*. Yet afterwards *God* was pleased to *confer* that *further Honour* upon him of the *Man from Heaven*, and κατ' ἐξουίαν, which gave him a *present title* to *Paradise*, and thereby a *Title in reversion* to *Heaven*, which was typified by *Paradise* as a *Covenanting Symbol*. This therefore entitled him to that *first Translation* into *Paradise*, which *Theophilus* observes as *then* performed by *God* immediately, in the *History of Genesis*. To this he was entitled on account of the *Spiritualizing* of his *Soul* by the union of the *Spirit* with it. The *remaining Translation*, mentioned by *Theophilus*, as expected after the *Resurrection* and the *Judgment*, is plainly that of the *Body*, when *that* also was to be *cloathed* with the *Spiritual Body*. Till then the *Body* could have no claim to *Immortality* or *Heaven*, or *Paradise* as a *Type of Heaven*. But this could not be expected till the *coming of Christ*, whose *Office* it is, to *change our vile Bodies*, and to *fashion them like his Glorious Body*. By this whole *Reasoning* it appears, that neither *Soul* nor *Body* was *then* thought to have any *Right to Immortality* but by the *Spirit*. And that, upon account of those *Mystical Reasonings*, which were most generally received in the *Age of the Apostles*, and in the *Writings of the New Testament*.

Tertul-

Tertullian is the most ancient of the *Latin* Fathers now extant. I mean, of them who wrote in *Latin*. He therefore is the best *Witness* we can expect of the Sense of the *Occidental Church*, in that early Age I am now concerned in. And he is of the same Opinion with his now mentioned *approved Predecessors*. He does indeed own the *actual Immortality* of the *Soul*, as we have seen the rest did, excepting *Tatian*. Especially of all who were, on that account, obliged to come over as *Profelytes* upon the *Publication* of the *Gospel*. And he had confuted the Opinion of *Hermogenes*, in a Book now lost, who took the *Soul* to be *è suggestu materiæ*, de An. c. 1. This the *Cartesians* may perhaps take for an Argument of its *natural Immortality*, who think its *Distinction* from *Matter*, a sufficient *Proof* of its *Independence* on *Matter*, and consequently of its *natural Immortality*. But they can never prove that nothing but *Modifications* of *Matter* can depend on *Matter*, as to their *Being* and *Preservation*. The *Reasoning* is far from being *Self-evident*. Nor was it ever (that I know of) granted by any before *Descartes*. However, *Tertullian* had such Opinions concerning the *Soul*, as are inconsistent with its *Independence* upon *purè Matter*, tho' it might survive the grosser *Organical Body* of our *Visible Humanity*. He plainly owns

14.
Tertullian
thought the
Soul ex-
traduce,
and there-
fore natu-
rally Mor-
tal.

our Souls now to be *ex traduce*, as much begotten by the Souls, as our Bodies are by the Bodies of our immediate Parents. He tells us that God made Adam's Soul *matricem omnium*, and that all the variety of Humours that are in his Posterity, would also have been in him, *ut in fonte natura — si varietas natura fuisset*, de An. c. 20. He makes it *Ingredient* in the Description of all our Souls, that they do *ex unâ redundare*, c. 21. He gives it as his own Opinion, *in utero concipi animam, cum carnis figuratione compingi atque produci*, c. 25. He makes the Soul to be introduced *de semine*, and *ex anima semine*, ib. He makes *duas species seminis, corporalem & animale*, *indiscretas tamen — & hoc modo contemporales, ejusdemque momenti*. Again: *In illo ipso voluptatis ultimæ æstu quo genitale virus expellitur, nonne aliquid de animâ quoque sentimus exire, atque adeo marcescimus & devigescimus cum lucis detrimento? Hoc erit semen animale protinus ex anima destillatione, sicut & virus illud corporale semen ex carnis defecatione, Fidelissima primordii exempla de limo caro in Adam. Quid aliud limus quàm liquor optimus? Inde erit genitale virus, ex adflatu Dei anima. Quid aliud adflatus Dei, quàm vapor Spiritûs? Inde erit quod per virus illud efflamus. Quum igitur in primordio duo diversa atque divisa, limus & flatus, unum hominem coegissent, confusæ substantiæ*
ambæ

ambæ jam in uno semina quoque sua miscuerunt, atque exinde generi propagando formam traderunt, ut & nunc duo licet diversa, etiam unita pariter effluant, pariterque insinuata sulco & arvo suo, pariter hominem ex utrâque substantia effruticent, in quo rursus semen suum insit secundum genus, sicut omni conditioni genitali præstitutum est. Igitur ex uno homine tota hæc animarum redundantia agitur, observante scilicet naturâ Dei edictum; Crescite, & in multitudinem proficite. Nam & in ipsâ præfatione operis unius: Faciamus hominem, universa posteritas pluraliter prædicata est, & præ sint piscibus maris. Nihil mirum, repromissio segetis in semine, c. 27. Again: Constitueramus animam in ipso, & ex ipso seri homine, & unum esse à primordia semen, sicut & carnis, in totum generis examen, &c. c. 36. He adds, that the anima is in utero seminata pariter cum carne. He owns the Difference of Sex in the Souls, as well as in the Bodies. He owns the Soul to have a Body, and plainly in another Sense from that wherein he ascribes Corporeity to God himself. He owns the same Progress in the Powers of the Soul, as in the Body, though not in its Substance, for fear of actual Mortality, c. 37. Such a Soul as this is (though it might survive the gross Organical Body; yet) even Cartesians themselves could not believe it independent on Matter in its own Nature. If therefore it

be preserved from *actual Mortality*, it must be by the like Interposition of an *extraordinary Providence*, as that by which our *Bodies* themselves are to be *immortalized* after the *Resurrection*. I know how severely this *Doctrine* is *censur'd*, by those who have more regard to the *Consent* of the *present Churches*, than the *Original Traditions* of the *Primitive Church*, with as *unanimous Consent* then, as can be pretended now. But it was *then* thought very *reconcilable* with all that was *then* taken for *Apostolical Tradition*.

15.
That Opinion of Tertullian, though generally deserted in the end of the 4th Century (when the Opinion that favoured the natural Immortality of the Soul begun) yet was not, even then, condemned.

About the fourth Century, the present *Doctrine* concerning the *Creation* of *Souls* seems to have begun; and in the *Sense Creation*, is understood by the *Modern Schoolmen*. From that time the *Western Churches* especially, have been pleased with that *turn* of *S. Augustin*, that *creando infunditur, & infundendo creatur*. Yet even *S. Augustin* himself, who takes notice of this *Doctrine* of *Tertullian*, and that in his Book *de Hæresibus*, dares not however *condemn* it for a *Heresie*. He confines the *Heresie* of *Tertullian* to his siding with the *Montanists*. No doubt, very well remembering, that in the *Reconciliation* of the few remaining *Tertullianists* with the *Church* (which he mentions as performed within his own *Memory*) no other *Recantation* was exacted or expected from them, but only that of the

the Communion, and the Characteristical Doctrines, of the Montanists: So also Ruffinus. He mentions several late Disputes concerning the beginning of the Soul, and several Opinions then received concerning it. Among them this: *Quod pariter cum corpore per humani seminis traducem etiam anima diffundatur.* He adds: *Quod puto inter Latinos Tertullianum sensisse, vel Lactantium, fortassis & alios nonnullos.* But his own Opinion he durst not determine; *Usque ad præsens certi vel definiti aliquid de hac Quaestione non teneo, sed Deo relinquo scire quid sit in vero, & si cui ipsi revelare dignabitur.* And he gives this Reason of his Reservedness: *Adhuc ignorare confiteor præter hoc quod manifestè tradit Ecclesia: Deum esse & animarum & corporum conditorem.* This is all that was defined by the Church then. The Church had neither declared against this Doctrine of Tertullian, which supposed the Soul's natural Mortality, nor declared for the contrary Doctrine of its natural Immortality, and its immediate Creation, which has since prevailed. For even this was one of the Opinions mention'd by him before, wherein he durst not be positive for this very Reason, because the Church had not as yet declared her Sense in favour of it. So in this Case he pleads for himself, when he was accused by S. Hierome of Heresie, for transla-

Apolog. ad
Anastaf.

S. Hierom
ad Ruffin.
L. 11. L.
111.

Ep. 82. Ed.
Mar. Vi-
ctor.

ting Origen's Books, *περὶ Ἀρχῶν*. And that in a Defence to Pope *Anastasius*, the first Bishop of the *Occidental Church*, upon that Accusation. Nor dares S. *Hierome*, even in the hight of his *Resentment*, condemn *Ruffinus* for not condemning this Opinion in *Tertullian*, though *himself* was against it, and was *unwilling* to excuse *Ruffinus* for being so *indifferent* in the Matter. Yet even he is more favourable, when his Concern against *Ruffinus* was in some measure allay'd by the *Death* of his Adversary. Then he owns it, as not only the Sense of *Tertullian*, but of *Apollinaris*, and of the greatest part of the *Occidental Writers*, *Ut quomodo corpus ex corpore, sic anima nascatur ex animâ, & simili cum brutis animantibus conditione subsistat*. So he in his Epistle to *Marcellinus* and *Anapsychia*. This is the most invidious Consequence that can be inferred from this Doctrine of the *natural Mortality* of the Soul of Man, that it would be herein equal with the Souls of Beasts. Yet even this so warm a Man as S. *Hierome* durst not censure, even in an Age so distant from the Age of the Apostles, as that was wherein he wrote this, so long as the *Humane Soul* was, notwithstanding acknowledged secure from actual Mortality. Yet there are indeed very ancient Authors, who compare lapsed Men with the Beasts that perish. And perhaps not without the

Autho-

Authority of that known Passage of the *Psalmist*, *Pf.* *xlvi.* 13. 21. *St. Augustin* also is almost as diffident of the true *Original* of the *Soul*, in Relation to the Opinion of *Tertullian*, in his *Ep.* to *Optatus*, as *Rufinus* himself. And he takes notice of *S. Hierome's* ascribing that same Opinion to the *Occidental Church*, without *contradicting* it. The thing that inclined the *Occidentals* to it *then*, was, that they thought it most reconcilable with the then newly defined Doctrine of *Original Sin*. So *Pelagius* had objected, as *S. Augustin* there observes : *Si anima ex traduce non est, sed sola caro tantum habet traducem peccati ; sola ergo pœnam meretur.* Here then lay the *Difficulty* of both sides. On the one side, they could not easily account how a *new created Spirit* could contract a *Contagion* of *Sin* from *Adam*, without any *Traduction* of its *Being* from *him*. On the other side, they thought it likewise difficult to defend the *Immortality* of our *Souls*, if they were derived by *Traduction*, not from God *immediately*, but from the *Souls* of our *immediate Forefathers*. This made the zealous Defenders of *Original Sin*, wary of *censuring* this Doctrine of *Tertullian*, lest they should thereby drive *them* off from their *Communion*, who thought the Doctrine of *Original Sin* no way *defensible* without it. However they would never have run into one
Hereſie,

Hereſie, for avoiding *another*. It is therefore plain, that they did not *then*, in the beginning of the fifth Century, when theſe *Pelagian* Diſputes were ſtarted, believe this Doctrin of the Soul's natural Mortality *Heretical*, ſo long as there was no *Queſtion* made of its being *actually Immortal*. The Author of the *Dialogue*, under the Names of *S. Hierome* and *S. Auguſtin*, collected out of their own Works, gives us the Names of ſeveral *others*, who joined in this ſame Opinion with *Tertullian*. They are, *Apollonius*, *Pompeius*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius* and *Apollinaris*. Of theſe, *Apollonius* was a little elder than *Tertullian*, and had confuted the *Montaniſts*, whom *Tertullian* defended againſt him. Thence it appears, that this Doctrin of *Traduction* was not even *then* proper to the Sect of *Montanus*, nor condemned in him by the *Catholick Church*. *Apollonius* therefore is another *Witness* of this Doctrin in that Age.

16. As for *Tertullian*, as he is full, ſo he is not (that I can perceive) *ſingular*, if we conſider his Age. He derives the *Humane Soul* from the *Flatus Vitæ* in *Genesis*, as *S. Irenæus* and others, both his *Predeceſſors* and *Succeſſors*, did alſo, *de Anim. c. 3.* He diſtinguiſhes this *Flatus* or *πνεῦμα*, from *Spiritus* or *πνεῦμα*, as expreſſly as the ſame *S. Irenæus*, and from the ſame Paſſage of *Iſ. xlii 5.* from whence it is proved by *S. Ire-*

Tertullian is alſo otherwiſe very full in aſſerting the natural Mortality of the Soul, and in deriving its actual Immortality from the Spirit.

S. Irenæus and Theophilus. So Tertullian, c. 11. He does as plainly make this Spirit *adscititious*, not common to all Mankind, as the *Flatus* was. *Neque Dei, neque Diaboli Spiritus ex nativitate conferitur animæ, ib.* Though he makes the Soul the same with the Spirit in another Notion of the same Word, as it signifies that by which we *breath*, c. 10. He gives the Soul a Body, and a Shape, as well as St. Irenæus. Nor does he doubt, any more than he, but that the Spirit is the only solid Ground for the Claim of *Immortality*. As for *proper Immortality*, he allows it only to that which is *Innatum* and *Infectum*, that is, ἀγέννητον and ἀφθάρτον, in the Language of the Greek Philosophers, and therefore confines it to God alone, c. 21. And therefore he can allow no other *Immortality* but of *Grace*, to any *created* Beings. For this is the known Language and Principles, and Reasoning of Plato in his *Timæus*, and the generality of those who use these Terms, and must be understood accordingly. What therefore was *made*, and had a *Beginning*, if it have not an *End*, it cannot, in this way of Reasoning, be imputable to its own Nature, but to the Arbitrary Pleasure of God. In this therefore Tertullian professes himself of another Mind from Plato, who thought the Soul *Innatam*. On which Concession, Tertullian reasons thus : *Adjicit immortalem, incor-*

The Distinction between

incorruptibilem, incorporalem (quia hoc & Deum credidit) invisibilem, ineffigibilem, uniformem, principalem, rationalem, intellectualem. Quid amplius proscriberet animam, si eam Deum nuncuparet? Nos autem qui nihil Deo appendimus, hoc ipso animam longe infra Deum expendimus, quod natam eam agnoscimus; ac per hoc dilutioris Divinitatis, exilioris fœlicitatis, ut flatum, non ut Spiritum. Et, si immortalem, ut hoc sit Divinitatis; tamen passibilem, ut hoc sit nativitatis: ideoque & à primordio exorbitationis capacem, & inde etiam oblivionis affinem, c. 24. Immortality in all this Reasoning, is taken for an Attribute proper to God. And therefore the Immortality that agrees to a more dilute Divinity, to a Being far inferior to God (such he makes that which he ascribes to the Humane Soul) must be a more dilute Immortality, and far inferior to that which properly agrees to God. What can that be but a precarious Immortality, and perfectly depending on the Divine Favour? Plainly he owns it far inferiour to what it might have been expected, if the Soul, that is invested with it, had been the same with the Divine Spirit. Yet he ascribes all the Right the Body hath to the Resurrection, to the Spiritual Body, with which the Animal Body is then to be invested, which also is called Spiritual from the Spirit, then to be received by it, de Res. Carn. c. 53.

Origen's

Origen's private *Opinions* are rather favourable to that side of the Question, that magnifies the Nature of the *Humane Soul* beyond the Bounds of *Truth* and *Catholick Tradition*. That Consideration would, to be sure, have made him inclinable to take the uttermost Advantage true *Tradition* could have afforded him, against the *natural Mortality* of the *Soul*, and in favour of that *Divine Nature* of the *Flatus*, which with the *Spirit*, is its only security against *actual Mortality*. This is sufficient to secure his Testimonies of this kind from any Suspicion of the *Errors* and *Paradoxes*, with which his Doctrine has been charged, in the Disputes and Judicial Sentences given against him. In this Case his *Concernment* for the *contrary*, makes his Authority more worthy of Regard, than it would have been if he had been *less concerned*. Yet even he could find no Pretence of *Apostolical Tradition*, or Consent of the *Catholick Church* in his time, against the now mentioned Opinion of *Tertullian* concerning the *Soul's* being *ex traduce*, which supposes, though not its *actual*, yet its *natural Mortality*. His Words are very plain to this Purpose, in his *Preface* to his famous work *περί Ἀρχῶν*. *De anima verò utrum ex semine traducis ducatur, ita ut ratio ipsius vel substantia inserta ipsis seminibus corporalibus habeatur, an verò aliud habeat initium:*

& hoc

17.

Origen knew no Tradition of the Church in his Age against that Opinion of Tertullian, though himself differed greatly from it. No, nor Pamphilus nor Eusebius.

& hoc ipsum initium, si genitum est, an non genitum: vel certè si intrinsecus corpori inditur, necne, non satis manifestâ prædicatione distinguitur. The *Prædication* here mentioned, is the same with that which he had before called the *Ecclesiastica Prædication per successionis ordinem ab Apostolis tradita, & usque ad præsens in Ecclesiâ permanens*. That he makes the *Rule* within which he designed to confine his future *Disputes* designed in this *Work*, very piously and prudently. He was wary of giving wanton *Wits* a *Precedent* for calling any thing in *Question*, that might any way affect those *Doctrines* wherein the *Catholick Church* of that *Age* was agreed, as derived from the *Apostles*. This therefore shews that he was very secure that *Catholick Tradition* had determined nothing contrary to this *Doctrine*, which would, in the *Consequence*, make the *Soul* naturally *Mortal*. *Pamphilus* in his *Apology* for *Origen*, has more *Testimonies* of the same kind out of other *Passages* of his *Works*, by which we know that this *Acknowledgment* was the *Result* of *Origen's* most deliberate and sedate *Thoughts*. *Pamphilus* also, in repeating these *Affertions* of *Origen* with *Approbation*, shews, that even his own *Age* was as ignorant of any *Apostolical Tradition* inconsistent with this *Doctrine*, as that of *Origen*. Yet he is aware of the *Consequence*, that, if
the

the Soul should be *ex traduce*, it must be *Mortal*: So he reasons: *Sed & illud quod sequitur, quod perabsurdum est incurrere, non praevident, quia necesse est eam simul cum corpore mori, & esse mortalem si simul cum corpore vel seminata, vel formata, vel nata est.* It is *actual Mortality* that he proves would be the *Consequence*, as appears by the *Argument* he afterwards insists on. This therefore is that he takes *here* for on *Absurdity*, and afterwards for *contradictory* to the *true Faith*. So *Pamphilus* also will be another Witness for us. *S. Hierome* makes *Eusebius* the Author of that *Apology* ascribed to *Pamphilus* by *Ruffinus*. And he does so with a *Design* of overthrowing the Credit of *Ruffinus*. But I see no Reason why it may not have been written by *both* of them. And, if so, we shall then have two Testimonies more confirming that of *Ori-gen*, and carrying it *lower* than he did, that, even in the *beginning* of the fourth Century, there was yet no consentient *Tradition* of the *Catholick Church* against this Opinion.

S. Cyprian's Thoughts concerning our *first* and *second Nativity*, may be learn'd from these Words of his Epistle to *Pompeius*: *Porro autem non per manus impositionem quis nascitur quando accipit Spiritum sanctum, sed in Baptismo; ut Spiritum jam natus accipiat, sicut in primo homine Adam factum est. Ante enim Deus eum plasmavit, & tunc insufflavit*

18.
S. Cyprian
owns the
same Di-
stinction
between our
first Birth,
by which we
receive our
Souls; and
the second
by which we
receive the
Spirit.

sufflavit in faciem ejus flatum vitæ. Nec enim potest accipi Spiritus, nisi prius fuerit qui accipiat. To which may be added, those other Words of his in his Epistle to *Fidus*, concerning the Baptism of Infants: *Prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quod secundum Adam carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiquæ primæ nativitate contraxit. Qui ad remissionem peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipso facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria, sed aliena peccata.* The first Nativity of Adam is his *Plasmation*, as he calls it, out of the dust of the *Earth*. This was that which was capable of receiving the first Life from the *Flatus Vitæ*. That *Flatus Vitæ* in S. Cyprian's Master, *Tertullian*, is the *πρὸν ζῶνς* by which he became a *ψυχὴ ζῶσα*, as the *Apostle* himself observes from the Passage of *Genesis*. This we receive from Adam, and by receiving this alone, we are reckon'd as *carnaliter nati secundum Adam*, as descending from the *Flesh* of Adam, and in Opposition to the *Spiritual Nativity* in Baptism, as *Flesh* and *Spirit* are opposed in the Reasonings of the *Sacred Writers*. By this we are said, *contagium mortis antiquæ contrahere*. Exactly answering the Reasoning of the *Apostle*, that reckons us in Adam, whilst we have no more than this living Soul which we receive from Adam; and reckons withal this State of Being in Adam, as

as a state of *Mortality*, because this *living Soul*, which we have as descending from him, is not *alone* sufficient to secure us from that *actual Mortality*, to which he was condemned immediately upon his *fall*. This is that *mors antiqua*, in allusion to the *old Man*, and the *first Adam*, mentioned by *S. Paul*, and in *opposition* to the *second Death* in the *Revelations*, from the *new* and *diviner Life*. The *second Birth* therefore he makes in *Baptism*, and the *second Life* is by him ascribed to the *Spirit* given after *Baptism*, by the *Imposition* of the *hands* of the *Bishop*. This therefore, as *stopping* that *Contagion* of the *old Death*, must needs be taken for a *Principle* of *Immortality*. And it is plainly a *preternatural Principle*, as being *distinct* from that by which *Adam* became a *living Soul*. However, as it is a *Principle* of a *new* and *immortal Life*, *S. Cyprian* uses the word *animari*, concerning the *Holy Ghost* himself. So : *In novam vitam lavacro aquæ salutaris animatus*. And again : *Terrenum fuisse, quod prius carnaliter natum delictis obnoxium viveret ; Dei esse cæpisse, quod jam Spiritus Sanctus animaret*. He speaks this of his *new Baptismal State* ; *Postquam cælitus Spiritu hausto, in novum me hominem Nativitas secunda reparavit*. This is the *Man* from *Heaven*, in the language of the *Apostle*, and *Plato*. By this therefore the *Apostle*

F

inti-

intimates, That, though this *adventitious Nature* did not belong to the Constitution of *Humane Nature* at its *first Creation*, yet it did to the Constitution of *that Man*, which the *Christians* of *that* and the *former Age* call'd the *perfect* and *spiritual Man*.

19. *Arnobius* has his Paradoxes on this Subject, for which himself *alone* is responsible. And his Case is the more excusable, considering that he was but a *Catechumen* when he wrote his *Book*, and was not thoroughly instructed in the *Christian Doctrine*. But he is more to be regarded when he speaks *conformably* to the sense of *other Catholick Doctors* of that *early Age*. So he does when he confutes *Plato* for making the *Humane Souls* the *Offspring* of *God*, and *Immortal* in such a *sense*, as those Beings, which were so, were reputed, on that very account, of their being of a *Divine Original*. This *Tertullian* had done before him, as I have already observed. This he does frequently, through a great part of his second Book. Neither he therefore, nor the others, who *reasoned* as he did, could understand the passage of *Aratus* approved by *S. Paul*, of all *Souls* in general, but only of the capacity all *those* were in of being *immortaliz'd* who *heard* the *Gospel*. Yet even the *Immortality* of *such* Beings he proves not *Natural* but perfectly depending on the *Divine Pleasure* from the express

Arnobius owns our Souls Mortal in their own Nature, and Immortal only by the Spirit.

press words of Plato in his *Timæus*. He makes therefore their *Longævity* (that's his word) *summi principis munus ac beneficium*, p. 65. He blames the *Platonists* for expecting the *πέρωσις* at their deaths. On the contrary, he delivers his own Opinion thus : *Nos nobis nihil de nostrâ infirmitate promittimus, Naturam intuentes nostram virium esse nullarum*, p. 66. Again : *Nos tantam reformidamus audaciam, nec in nostrâ ducimus esse positum potestate, sedes superas petere ; cum & hoc ipsum habeamus incertum, an vitam accipere mereamur, & ab lege mortalitatis abduci*, ib. *Sed immortales perhibentur Dii esse. Non ergo Natura, sed voluntate Dei patris ac munere. Quo igitur pacto immortalitas largitoris est Donum DEI circa prolatos*, [This is from the language of those Philosophers by whose example the *Gnosticks* call'd their *Æons* *ωεβολὰς*] *& animas hoc pacto dignabitur immortalitate donare, quamvis eas mors sæva posse videatur extinguere, & ad nihilum redactas irremediabili abolitione delere*, p. 68. Then he proves his Doctrine concerning their Gods, from Plato's *Timæus*, ib. & p. 87. He again makes it the *Prerogative* of God alone to make Souls Immortal : *cui soli potestas est talia corruptione exclusa largiri*, p. 79. And he very frequently owns it for his own Opinion, That the Souls of Men are of a middle Nature between Mortality and Im-

mortality, and capable of either, as God is pleased to allot it to them, herein agreeing with *Theophilus Antiochenus*. So p. 52. *Sunt enim mediæ qualitatis sicut Christo auctore compertum est, & interire quæ possint, Deum si ignoraverint; vitæ & ab exitio liberari, si adejus se minas atque indulgentias applicarint.* So again, p. 65, 67, 79. And he grants this, not only of *Humane Souls*, but of all other Beings whatsoever, excepting only the Supreme: *Omnes omnino, quos esse opinatio suspicatur, Dii, Angeli, Dæmones, aut nomine quocunque sunt alio, qualitatis & ipsi sunt mediæ, & in ambiguae sortis conditione mutabiles*, p. 67. Accordingly, he makes *annihilation* (though a tedious one, and therefore with a more exquisite torment) to be the Punishment of the Damned. So p. 52. *Illa quæ sub oculis cernitur, animarum est a corporibus dijugatio, non finis abolitionis extremus. Hæc, inquam, est hominis mors vera, cum animæ nescientes Deum per longissimi temporis cruciatum consumentur igni sero, in quem illas jacent quidam crudeliter savi, & ante Christum incogniti, & ab solo sciente detecti*, p. 86. *Res vestra in ancipiti sita est, salus, dico, animarum vestrarum, & nisi vos applicatis Dei principis notioni, à corporalibus vinculis exolutos expectat mors sæva, non repentinam afferens extinctionem, sed per tractum temporis cruciabilis pænæ acerbitate consumens.* He therefore did not believe
any

any *Humane Souls* actually immortalized besides those of the good. And, in their Case, he ascribes their *Immortality* to God's Pleasure in giving them his *Spirit*. So p. 87. *Servare animas alius, nisi Deus Omnipotens, non potest : nec præterea quisquam est, qui longævas facere, perpetuitatis possit & S P I R I T U M subrogare, nisi qui immortalis & perpetuus solus est, & nullius temporis circumscriptione finitus.* Ev'n he, who makes all other Beings, besides the Supreme, naturally Mortal: and, if Immortal, yet only so precariously: does notwithstanding own this *Divine Spirit* so Immortal in it self, as withal to be a Principle of Immortality to those *Human Souls* to which God is pleased to grant it. Yet he concerns *Christ* also in giving this *Spirit*. So p. 89. *Unius Pontificium Christi est, dare animis salutem, & S P I R I T U M perpetuitatis apponere.* As granted to him by the Father, as *Arnobius* himself had observed before. This is the reason why the *Spirit*, though it be said to proceed from the Father, is notwithstanding call'd the *Spirit of Christ* by the Sacred Writers themselves. Allowing therefore for the *Paradoxes* of *Arnobius*; yet he is full, and not without *Authority* of those who understood the *Christian Religion* better than he did, in the two principal *Assertions* for which I am concerned at present: That of the *Soul's Mortality* by Na-

F 3

ture,

The Distinction between

ture, and that it's actual Immortality was owned as received from the Spirit.

20. *So also Lactantius.* *Lactantius* takes some liberty as well as his Master *Arnobius*. But in the main, his Opinion seems to have been the same with the eminent Persons now mentioned. He also takes *Man* to be of a middle Nature, capable of Immortality as a reward of his good behaviour ; otherwise *Mortal*, if he did not answer expectation. God, he says, made them *inter bonum malumque medias, ut constantibus ex utrisque naturis virtutem proponeret, ne immortalitatem delicate assequerentur ac molliter, sed ad illud æternæ vitæ inelodabile præmium summâ cum difficultate ac magnis laboribus pervenirent*, Instit. vii. 5. Again, *Nam quia homo ex duabus rebus constat, corpore atque animâ, quorum alterum terrenum est, alterum cæleste ; duæ vitæ homini attributæ sunt : una temporalis, quæ corpori assignatur ; altera sempiterna, quæ animæ subiacet. Illam nascendo accepimus, hanc assequimur laborando ; ne immortalitas, (ut ante diximus) sine ullâ difficultate constaret.* And he expressly denies this Immortality to be the effect of Nature. So afterwards : *Virtuti enim, non Naturæ, datur ; quia voluit nos Deus vitam nobis in vitâ comparare.* Again : *Nam nihil interesset inter justum & injustum ; si quidem omnis homo natus immortalis fieret. Ergo immortalitas non sequela Naturæ, sed merces præmiumque virtutis est.* He not only denies this

this, but owns our title to *Immortality* as derived from our *Baptism*, and our *Baptismal Spirit* which we there receive. His words are very remarkable to this purpose : *Quæ ratio docet, mortalem nasci hominem ; postea verò immortalem fieri, cum cæperit ex Deo vivere, id est, justitiam sequi ; quæ continetur in Dei cultu ; cum excitaverit hominem Deus ad aspectum cœli ac sui Quod tum fit, cum homo cœlesti lavacro purificatus, exponit infantiam cum omni labe vitæ prioris ; & incremento Divini vigoris accepto, fit homo perfectus ac plenus.* This perfect Man, in the style of the *Apostle* and *St. Irenæus*, is he who has the *Divine Spirit* received in our *Saviour's Regenerating Baptism*, which therefore must be the *Principle of Immortality* here mentioned. This is the Spirit which, *Lactantius* says, God puts into a *terrene Body*, and which he calls *sempiternum*, vii. 12. and *æternum*, ib. è cœlo & à Deo, ii. 12. vii. 4, 5. ii. 11. ex Deo, 12. à Deo inspiratam, vii. 12. which he calls *animam* : *Fictò corpore spiravit ei animam de vitali fonte Spiritûs sui, qui est perennis.* Which, he makes *Immortal*, if it be victorious : *ut si anima superaverit, quæ ex Deo oritur, sit immortalis, & in perpetuâ luce versetur.* And *L. iii. 12.* he says the same of the *Human Spirit*. But he cannot mean it to be so *naturally*, if it be so no otherwise than *conditionally*. He has withal a clear notion of *Soul*, as distinct

The Distinction between

from the Spirit, so distinctly and independently subsistent, as that being actually separated. one will be a Principle of Mortality, the other of Immortality, to him that has them. So L. vii. c. 5. *Cum posset semper spiritibus suis immortalibus innumerabiles animas procreare, sicut angelos genuit, quibus immortalitas sine ullo malorum periculo ac metu constat : excogitavit tamen inenarrabile opus, quemadmodum infinitam multitudinem crearet animarum, quas primo fragilibus & imbecillis corporibus illigatas, constitueret inter bonum malumque medias ; ut constantibus ex utrisque naturis virtutem proponeret ; ne immortalitatem delicatè assequerentur ac molli-ter ; sed ad illud æternæ vitæ ineloquibile præmii summâ cum difficultate ac magnis laboribus pervenirent.* The way therefore, according to Lactantius, taken by Providence, for making Man's actual Mortality or Immortality the Reward or Punishment of his Free-will, was to join his Soul to his Body immediately ; which being it self Frail and Mortal, cou'd not secure the Soul from actual Mortality. This he supposes would make the Complex of the Soul and Body actually Mortal. But this Reasoning could not hold, unless he had believed the Soul Naturally Mortal as well as the Body. Otherwise the Nature of the Soul alone had been sufficient for its own preservation from actual Mortality, though the Body had contributed

buted nothing to it. But he supposes that whole State of *Man Mortal*, and that the addition of the *Spirit* to both made both *Immortal*. He makes the Body *immortalitatis expers*, and makes that *Happiness*, which the *Philosophers* ascribed *non corpori, sed animo*, to have relation only *ad hanc vitam, quæ cum corpore terminatur*, L. iii. c. 12. So far he is from owning the *Immortality* of this *Soul*, in contradistinction to the *Spirit*, as *natural* to it, that he seems to own its *actual Death*, for the space between the *Death* of the *Body* and the *Resurrection*. He therefore ascribes the *Resurrection* to the *Soul* as well as the *Body*. His words are these : *Et quia temporalem vitam temporalis mors sequitur ; consequens est, ut resurgant animæ ad vitam perennem ; quia finem mors temporalis accepit*, L. vii. c. 10. *Servatus Gallæus* is here mistaken, when he takes this for an *Impropriety of Speech*, which is, in truth, a *real Consequence* from the *Principles* of *Lactantius*. Yet he denied the *Traduction* of the *Souls* from the *Human Parents*, *de Opific. Dei*, c. 19. but makes them the *immediate work* of *God* himself, and observes the passages even of *Lucretius*, to this purpose. In this he differs from the doctrine of *Tertullian*, who thought only the *Soul* of *Adam* produced by *God*, but that the other *Souls* descended from *his*, by the *prolifick Virtue* given by the words, *increase*

crease and multiply, as our Bodies are derived from *his Body*. Which form of Speech, though it could not be used by *Lactantius* concerning *Human Souls*; yet it is, where his *Principles* would allow of it, in relation to the *Human Body*. In that regard, he owns only *one Man* formed by God, L. vii. c. 4. Herein therefore *Lactantius* also seems to have imitated *Tatian* in owning the *actual Mortality* of the *Soul*, though only for so short a time. But, as for the *wicked*, he differed from the Opinion of his Master *Arnobius*. He does not allow them the benefit of a *Punishment* that might, at length, annihilate them, though with very tedious, as well as very exquisite, Tortures. *Lactantius*, on the contrary, makes that Punishment *Eternal*. So L. ii. c. 12. concerning the *Death* of the *wicked*, he says, *Cujus non ea vis est, ut injustas animas extinguat omnino, sed ut puniat in eternum*. Yet *Lactantius* owns a Title of our *Souls* to *Immortality*, on that account, of their being a *Divine Off-spring*. So he calls even *those* of them who miscarry, *animas ad cœlestia genitas*, L. vii. c. 6. But that can only signify their being the fairest *Candidates* for the *Divine Favours* indefinitely; not any *immediate* claim to this particular one of *Immortality*. And their being *Genitæ* is alone sufficient to overthrow their Title to it, on account of their own *Nature*. Yet that is the word used by him
in

in the former Chapter for expressing the *Original of Human Souls* in general. If he had not declared against *Traduction* in the former Work now mention'd, this word wou'd have tempted one to suspect, that he had in earnest favoured *that* Original of the Soul. But take the word in a *less restrained sense*, it will however either prove, or be consistent with, a *precarious Immortality*. With the *Platonists*, that could be no otherwise *Immortal* that was γεννητόν as that signified a *begotten*, or γέννητόν as that signified a *factitious Being*. And, even by our *modern Reasonings*, it will at least, not imply any *necessity* of an *Immortality* by *Nature*. Even *Lactantius* himself owned that the *first Man* was made by God, as to both parts, that of his *Body*, as well as of his *Soul*. Yet he did not therefore make him *Immortal*. But having here declared for an *Immortality* depending on Man's own behaviour, *Lactantius* cou'd not mean the *Heaven* and *Immortality*, to which he makes the Soul *born*, as due to it on account of its own *Nature*. By the *Soul* therefore which he also elsewhere calls *Spirit*, iii. 12. he means the *Flatus*, or πνοή, which was an *inferiour created Being*. And by the *Spirit*, in the *contradistinct* sense, that much more *Divine Being*, which is the *Principle of Immortality*. Yet he sometimes ascribes *Animation* to it, not without *Authority*, as
this

this also is an Ingredient in the *perfect* or *full Man*, who can claim a place in the *πλήρωμα*, as being himself the *Archetypal Ideal Man*.

21.
St. Athanasius owns
the Natural Mortality of
the Soul,
& ascribes
its Actual Immortality to the
Spirit received from
the *Λόγος*.

I have now brought the Tradition down to the *fourth Century*. I shall only add one more ; but as great and generally received a *Standard of Orthodoxy*, as any one I know of in that *distance* from the *Apostles*, to this very Day : That is, the great *Athanasius*. He does indeed own the Doctrine of the *Soul's Immortality*, as a *Doctrine of the Church*. His words are plain : "Οτι ὅτι καὶ ἀθάνατον ἔχουσιν ἡ ψυχὴ, καὶ τὸ τοῦ ἀναγκάσιον εἶδέναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, *Orat. cont. Gent. p. 35*. Nor does any concern of my present Cause oblige me to *Question* his *Truth* in saying so. My present Dispute is only whether that same Doctrine of the Church of his *Age* believed it *immortal* of its *own Nature*. And that the Church did not so believe it *immortal*, at least that *Athanasius* did not think that this was the *Doctrine of the Church* in that *Age* ; I think I shall not need a fuller Witness than his *own*. I know no reason to doubt but that he believed *himself* as he knew the Church did, in whose Cause he was so great a *Champion*, and so glorious a *Confessor*. And he himself seems very plain, in the Case of its *Natural Mortality*. He owns Mankind ἔχεισαν κατὰ τὸ ἴδιον γένος λόγον

λόγον διαμένειν αἰεί. *de Incarn. verb. p. 56.*
 Accordingly he ascribes all the Hopes of
Immortality in Man, rather than other Ani-
 mals, to that which is peculiar in him,
 and which no other *Earthly* Animal can
 pretend to, which the *Scripture* calls the
Image of God, the ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα ἀνδρωπῶ, *as Philo*
and the Fathers call it, as derived
 from the Λόγῳ, who is himself the εἰκὼν
 of the *Father*. By him God the *Father* is
 said to secure Mankind from that actual
Mortality, to which otherwise the frail Ma-
 terials of his natural Constitution would
 render him obnoxious : μεταδὲς αὐτοῖς καὶ τῷ
 τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ δυνάμεως ἵνα ὥσπερ σκιάς τινος
 ἔχοντες τῷ λόγῳ καὶ γνόμῳ λογικοί, διαμένειν
 ἐν μακαριότητι δυνήσῃσι, ζῶντες τῷ ἀληθινῷ
 καὶ ὅντως τῷ ἀγίῳ ἐν Παράδεισῳ βίον. This
Happy Life in *Paradise* had given him, if
 he had persisted in it, a farther Title to an
Eternal State of Happiness in Heaven, of
 which *Paradise* was only a *Covenanting*
Symbol ; but revocable by his *Misbehaviour*,
 which depended on his own *Free-will*.
 This therefore was to be fixed as far as was
 consistent with its *Nature*. And the way
 taken by God for fixing it, was by the *Law*
 imposed concerning the *Forbidden Fruit*,
 the Conditions whereof are thus expressed
 by him : ἵνα εἰ μὲν φυλάττοιεν τὸ χάριον, καὶ
 μένοιεν καλοί, ἔχουσι τὸ ἐν Παράδεισῳ ἀλυπτον
 καὶ ἀνώδυνον καὶ ἀμέριμνον ζῶν, πρὸς τῷ καὶ τῷ
 εἰ

ἐν ἔρανοῖς ἀρδαρίας αὐτὰς τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχειν.
 εἰ δὲ παραβᾶν καὶ γραφέντες γένοιτο φαῦλοι,
 γινώσκουσιν ἑαυτὰς τὴν ἐν θανάτῳ κατὰ φύσιν
 φθορὰν ὑπομένειν, καὶ μηκέτι μὲν ἐν Παραδείσῳ
 ζῆν, ἔξω δὲ τέρας λοιπὸν ἀποθνήσκουσιν μένειν ἐν
 τῷ θανάτῳ, καὶ ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ. Thus far he
 supposes us only enabled to be *immortal* if
 we please, but still supposes *Death* and *Cor-*
ruption most agreeable to our own *Nature*,
 if deserted by the *Divine Favour*, notwith-
 standing the *Divine Breathing*, which is
 the *Image of God*. Accordingly he ex-
 pounds the *Divine Threat*, θανάτῳ ἀποθα-
 νείδει, in case they should break the *Law*
 against the *Forbidden Fruit*, that it means,
 μὴ μόνον ἀποθνήσκειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ τῷ θά-
 νάτῳ φθορᾷ μένειν. And he makes this the
 Event when they had broken it : ἡ παρά-
 βασις τὴν ἐντολῆς εἰς τὸ κατὰ φύσιν αὐτὰς ἐπέ-
 σπερην, ἵνα ὥσπερ ἐκ ὄντες γεγόνασιν, ἔτι καὶ
 τὴν εἰς τὸ ἐν φθορᾷ ὑπομένωσι τῷ χρόνῳ,
 p. 57. And he gives this Account of the
 Agreeableness of the *Punishment* to the
Crime committed in the Fall : Εἰκότως.
 Εἰ γὰρ φύσιν ἔχοντες τὸ μὴ εἶναι ποτε τῇ τῷ λόγῳ
 παρσία καὶ φιλανθρωπία εἰς τὸ ἐν ἐκλήρισαν,
 ἀχόλυστον ἦν κενωθέντας τὰς ἀνθρώπους τὴν περὶ
 θεῶν ἐννοίαν καὶ εἰς τὰ ἐκ ὄντα ἀποσεφέντας —
 κενωθῆναι καὶ τῷ ἐν αἰεί τῷ τοῦ δὲ ὅτι τὸ δια-
 λυθέντας μένειν ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ καὶ τῇ φθορᾷ.
 This cannot be the *Second Death* because it
 is so frequently described by a *ceasing to be*,
 and

and a *ceasing* to be for ever, never by an *Eternity of Punishment*. Yet it must be understood of the *whole Man*. Otherwise it cou'd be no great Unhappiness to him, if his *Body* perished alone, and his *Soul* (that part of him alone which is capable of being happy) had still *continu'd*, and to *Eternity*. Yet this kind of *Death*, this Great Man makes *natural* to our whole *Kind*, when divested of *Supernaturals*. He goes on to the same purpose: Ἐστὶ μὲν γὰρ, κατὰ φύσιν ἀνθρώπου θνητός· ὅτε δὲ ἐκ ὧν γερονώς. Διὰ τοῦτο ὅτι πρὸς τὰ ὅντα ὁμοιότησα, ἣν ἐρύλαττε διὰ τοῦτο πρὸς αὐτὴν κατανοήσεως, ἡμβλυνεν ἂν τὸ κατὰ φύσιν φθορὰν, καὶ ἔμεινεν ἀφθαρσίᾳ· κατὰπερ ἡ Σοφία φησὶν· πρὸς σοφίαν νόμων βεβαίωσις ἀφθαρσίας. He adds his *Authority* for both: why he believed this *Accession* of a *Divine Nature* would *immortalize* Mens Souls; and why he believed that *without* it they would be *mortal*. Ἀφθαρσίᾳ τοῦ ὧν, ἔστι λοιπὸν ὡς θεός, ὡς πατὴρ καὶ ἡ θεία γεγενῆσθαι σημαίνει λέγουσα· ἐγὼ εἶπα θεοὶ ἐστε, καὶ υἱοὶ ὑψίστου πάντες· ὑμεῖς τοῦ ὡς ἄνθρωποι ἀποθνήσκετε, καὶ ὡς εἰς τῶν ἀρχόντων πίπτετε. Men therefore, who are no more than what that Name entitles them to, must *naturally* die. And they only *live*, who have what St. Peter calls the *Divine Nature*; they πρὸς θεὸν ὁ λόγος τὸ θεὸν ἐγένετο. So our *Saviour* himself expounds this very passage of *Psal.* lxxxii. 6. in *Joh. x.* 35. as the *Spirit* in us
is

The Distinction between

is the εἰκὼν εἰκόνῳ, the *Image* of him who is the *Image* of his *Father*, the *Invisible God* ; the *Image* of the *second Adam*, the *Lord* from *Heaven*, proceeding on the *Mystical* way of *Reasoning* from the *Old Testament*, used in the *New*. Let any *Author* of the late *Systems* shew us as good *Authority* for his late *Notions*, if he can. But *St. Athanasius* goes on ; Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Θεὸς ἑ μόνον ἐξ ἐκ ὄντων ἡμᾶς πεποίηκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ κατὰ Θεὸν ζῶν ἡμῖν ἐχαρίσατο τῇ τῷ Λόγῳ χάριτι. Is not this the *Gift of God*, *Eternal Life* ? *Rom. vi. 23.* The blessed *Father* adds ; Οἱ ὅτι ἄνθρωποι ἀποσφαρέντες τὰ αἰώνια, καὶ συμβολία τῷ διαβόλῳ εἰς τὰ τῷ φθορᾷ ἐπιτραπέντες. ἑαυτοῖς αἴτιοι τῷ ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ φθορᾷ γεγόνασιν· ὄντες μὲν κατὰ φύσιν, ὡς περ εἶπον, φθαρτοὶ χάριτι ὅτι τῷ Λόγῳ μετεσῆας τῷ κατὰ φύσιν ἐκρυπόντες, εἰ μεμενήκεισαν καλοί. Διὰ γὰρ τῷ συνάντια τέτοις λόγον, καὶ ἡ κατὰ φύσιν φθορὰ τέτων ἐκ ἡγλίζε καὶ ὡς καὶ ἡ σοφία φῆσιν ὁ Θεὸς ἔκτισε τῷ ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ ἀρπαρσίαν καὶ εἰκόνα τῷ ἰδίας αἰδιότητι. φθόνῳ ὅτι διαβόλος θάνατον εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τῷ κόσμον. [*Sap. ii. 23, 24.*] Τέτοις ὅτι γενομένοις οἱ μὲν ἄνθρωποι ἀπέθνησκον, ἡ ὅτι φθορὰ λοιπὸν κατὰ αὐτῶν ἡκμαζεν καὶ πλεῖον καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ἰσχύοντα, κατὰ ὅλα τῷ γένε, ὅσα καὶ τῷ ἀπειλῶν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τῷ παράβασιν τῷ ἐντολῆς κατὰ αὐτῶν περιελήφει. This *Disadvantage*, to our *State of Mortality*, that follow'd from our *Violation* of the *Law* against the *Forbidden Fruit*, seems to be the same

same that is insisted on by the *Apostle*, Rom. vii. both as by *curbing* our *Appetites*, the *Law* that curb'd them made them more outrageous; and, as the *Divine Sentence* of *Death*, threaten'd in that same *Law*, added to our own *natural* Constitution, brought us under a double necessity of *dying actually*, which before was necessary only on one account of our *Frail* and *mortal Nature*.

The event therefore of this he makes *actual Death*; Διὰ τὴν ταῦτα πλεον τῆς θανάτου κρατήσαντο, καὶ τὴν φθορᾶς παρεμένεσσι κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τὸ μὲν τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένεσι ἐφείρετο· ὁ δὲ λογικὸς καὶ κατ' εἰκόνα γενόμενος ἀνθρώπου ἠφανίζετο· καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ τῆς θεῆς γενόμενον ἔργον παρὰ πᾶν λυσι, p. 58. The

withdrawing of the *Divine Image*, the *Principle* of *Immortality* is call'd ἀφανισμός, in opposition to the ἀράρωσις, the *obscuring* of it, which is supposed to be the effect of every *sin*. The *Epithets* belong to it as it is call'd a *Light*, as entitling us to the *inheritance* of the *Saints in Light*. As therefore the ἀράρωσις is its *shining darkly*, so as not to be easily *discerned*; so its ἀφανισμός, seems to imply its utter *disappearing*, which must suppose, if not its *extinction*, yet its *withdrawing* from us, so as to leave us to the *consequences* of our own *mortal Nature*. This he afterwards calls πάλιν εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι διὰ τὴν φθορᾶς ὁπιστρέφειν, p. 59. He afterwards makes this ἀφανισμός the same

with ἀραίρεσις. So he says of *Mankind* in general, that they were hereby τὴν τῆς κατ' εἰκόνα χάριν ἀραιρεθέντες, p. 60. This he calls παρηφανίζετο, also in the same page. So as ἀφανίζεν θανάτῳ, p. 61, 62. And elsewhere frequently. What can this mean less than a *ceasing to be*, when the only Title to *actual Immortality* is either *withdrawn*, or *extinguished*? This therefore he makes the *difficulty* in the *new design* of God in *restoring Mankind* to the *Immortality* originally *designed* for them. Repentance alone, he tells us, would not have been sufficient for it. Why so? Because the utmost *that* could do, would have been only sufficient to re-instate Mankind in his former *natural Condition*, when *Innocent*. At least, it could not *exalt* him *above* his *Nature*; ἔτε ἡ μετάνοια ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἀνακαλεῖται, ἀλλὰ μόνον παύει τῆς ἀμαρτημάτων, p. 59. So that being *left* to his *Nature*, which was *Mortal*, he must have *continued Mortal still*, notwithstanding his *Repentance*. Besides, the *Divine Veracity* obliged him to be *true* to his fore-mention'd *Threats*, of suffering *Nature* to take her course, and not to interpose in an *extraordinary* way for *preventing* it, when there was no *ingredient* in Man which could lay any claim to *Immortality*. So this Holy Person expresses himself: ἔτε τὸ εὐλογεῖν πρὸς τὸ θεὸν ἐρύλασεν. ἔμενε γὰρ πάλιν ἐκ ἀληθείας,

ἀληθῆς, μὴ κρατεμένων ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, p. 59. Both these Reasonings suppose *actual Mortality* to have been the state to which Mankind was reduced by the *Fall*, and that *Repentance alone* would not suffice for *re-instating* Mankind in the designed *Immortality*, without restoring him to the *Spirit*, the *Divine Principle*, which was *preternatural*, and had been *lost* by the *Fall*. Hereon he grounds the *necessity* why the Λόγος was to concern himself in *recovering* Man from this *fallen* state, the εἰκὼν *lost* was at *first* derived from *him*, and therefore could not be *recovered* unless *he* was pleased to *restore* it. Τίνος ὡς χρεία πρὸς τὴν τοιαύτην χάριν ἢ ἀνάκλησιν; ἢ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἢ ἐκ τῆς μὴ ὄντος πεποιηκότητος τὰ ὅλα τῆς θεῆς Λόγος; Αὐτῆς γὰρ ὡς πάλιν ἢ τὸ φθαρτὸν εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ἐνεῖκεν, ἢ τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων εὐλογεῖν ἀποσῶσαι πρὸς τὸ πατέρα. Λόγος γὰρ ὢν τῆς πατρὸς ἢ ὑπὲρ πάντας ὢν, ἀκολούθως ἢ ἀνακτῆται τὰ ὅλως Μόνος ὡς δυνατός, p. 60. Whosoever therefore had not the *Spirit* restored to him by the Λόγος, must, by this Reasoning, be *confirmed* in his *natural Mortality* by the threatning of *death* upon the *Fall*, that *God* might approve himself *Veracious*. That he would *immortalize* the *Refusers* of the *Gospel* to *Punishment*, could not be *known* till the Λόγος had *declared* his *Pleasure* concerning it, who had it in his *own* power *alone* to give

Life to whom, or as far, as he pleased ; or to leave them to their *natural Mortality*. To this he afterwards refers *Ebr. ii. 10. in p. 62.* Accordingly he makes it the Office of the Λόγος, who was himself the εἰκὼν of the Father, to restore the τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα ἀνθρώπου. The words he uses for this purpose are ἀνανεῶσαι, ἀνακαινίσαι, ἀνακτίσαι, p. 66. Because this *Man κατ' εἰκόνα* is the νέα or καινή κτίσις, which he makes the same with the ἀναγεννωμένη ἢ ἀνακτιζομένη ψυχή, p. 66. He therefore makes it proper to the Λόγος, ἀνθρώπου ψυχῷ ἢ ἀνθρώπων νῦν μελαπείσαι, p. 67. and ψυχῷ ἢ νῦν ὁρᾶν, *ib.* Whereby we may understand that the *Minds* as well as the *Souls* of *Men* needed this *Immortality* which none but the Λόγος could confer, which alone could secure them from relapsing to their *natural Mortality*. So he again tells us: Οὐκ ἄλλα ὡς τὸ φθαρτὸν εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν μεταβαλεῖν, εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς Σωτὴρ ὢν, τὸ ἢ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐξ ἐκ ὧντων πεποιητόν τε τὰ ἔλλα· ἢ ἐκ ἄλλης ἦν τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα πάλιν ἀνακτίσαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, εἰ μὴ τὸ εἰκόνον τε παλῶς· ἢ ἐκ ἄλλης ἦν τὸ θνητὸν ἀθάνατον ἀναστῆσαι, εἰ μὴ τὸ Αὐτοζῶης ἔσσης τε κυρίως ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, p. 72.

22.

The same
St. Atha-
nasiaus, and the Catholick Church with him, prove the necessity of our Saviour's assuming even the Supreme part of our Human Souls, against the Apollinarists, that even that might be rescued from actual Mortality.

The Controversie with *Apollinaris*, who made the Λόγος to perform the same Office

to *Christ*, as our *rational Soul* to us, gave him occasion to be *particular* in asserting the *Mortality* of our *Souls*, since the *Fall* of *Mankind* has reduced us to our *natural* Condition. This Topick he thought necessary to insist on, that he might prove the *necessity* of *Christ's* assuming a *Human Soul* as well as a *Human Body*, in order to the *rescuing* both from the *Mortality* whereto they were *both* sentenced. He therefore asserts the *Souls* to be ἐν δεσμοῖς, which *Bonds* he calls the δεσμός θανάτου. He tells us that *Death* held the *Souls* of *Men* in *Captivity* : θάνατος περιέχουσας ἡ ἀγγελὸς αὐτῶν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ψυχὴν εἰς δεσμῶν καλοχὴν. He gives a distinct Account how the *Soul* comes to be concerned in the Sentence of *Death* as well as the *Body* : That as the *Body* is concerned in that part of it, γῆ εἰ καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσῃ, So the *Soul* is concerned in the other, θάνατος ἀποθανῇ. *de Incarn. Christ.* p. 626. Here then appears the *necessity* why *Christ* should assume a *Human Soul*, that ὅπως κεκράτητο ἡ ψυχὴ ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη ἐν θανάτῳ, ἐκεῖ ὁπιδείκνυται ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ψυχὴν ἰδίαν ἔσαν, ἵνα καὶ παρῇ ὡς ἀνθρώπου ὁ ἀκράτητος ἐν θανάτῳ, καὶ λύσῃ τὴν κατὰ κράτος τῆς θανάτου ὡς θεός, p. 629, 630. Accordingly he makes our *Lord*, in his λύτρον paid for us, to give σῶμα ὑπὲρ σώματος, καὶ ψυχὴν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς, καὶ τελείαν ὑπαρξιν ὑπὲρ ὅλης ἀνθρώπου. He makes it no compleat Victory over-

The Distinction between

Death, if the Soul, which finned κατὰ φρόνησιν, knowingly and designedly (which the Body could not do) should not share in it : Πῶς ἢ κρᾶτησις τῆς θανάτου τελείαν ἐλάβανεν ἢ λύσιν, εἰ τὸ κατὰ φρόνησιν ἁμαρτήσαν, ἢ ψυχὴν Χριστὸς ἀναμάρτητον ἐσυνεσχίσατο ἑαυτῷ. Τὶ ἐν καθ' ὑμᾶς, βασιλεύει ὁ θάνατος. τῶς ἔσωθεν ἀνθρώπου ; Τίνος γὰρ ἄλλου, ἢ ἐβασίλευσέ ποτε ; ἐκ ψυχῆς ἢ ἐν φρονήσει ἁμαρτησάσης ; καθὼς ἐρηται, ψυχὴ ἢ ἁμαρτανόσα αὕτη ἢ ἀποθανεῖται, ὡς ἢς ἢ ἰδίαν ψυχὴν τέθεικεν ὁ Χριστὸς λύτρον ἀντιδιδόν, p. 631. He takes occasion also, from the same Hereticks, to give his Opinion of the Ψυχὴ and Πνεῦμα, the very same which is thought so Unscriptural and Uncatholick. The νεκρὰ ἀνθρώπου φύσις is, with him, the same with ψυχὴ. This some had call'd σαρκικὴ. Against whom he reasons thus : Πόθεν μαθόντες ἐσυνεπίσαμεν. Οὐτε γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας γραφῶν ὅτι ἐν εὐρεῖν τῆτο, ἔτε ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τῆς ἀνθρώπων λογισμῷ, τῶς Κυρίου λέγουσι, Μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῆς ἀποκλειστικῆς τοῦ σώματος ἢ τῆς ψυχῆς μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτεῖναι. Καὶ πῶς, εἰ σαρκικὴ ἢ ψυχὴ καθ' ὑμᾶς, ἐσυνθιήσκει τῷ σώματι ἢ συμρθείρειται ; Πῶς ἢ ἢ ὁ Πέτρος τὰς ἐν αἷματι κατεχομένας ψυχὰς πνεύματι ὀνομάσας ἔλεγεν, ἐπορεύθη τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ κατακειλεῖσθαι πνεύμασιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὴν ἀνάστασιν, p. 639, 640. The σαρκικὴ ψυχὴ is here plainly opposed to the πνευματικὴ, and for that Reason is supposed

supposed as capable of being *killed* by Men, as the *Body* it self, when that *Soul* is supposed destitute of the *Spirit*, which can alone secure it from the *actual Mortality*, which is also supposed to be *natural* to it. On the other side, the *Souls* in *Prison*, mention'd by St. *Peter*, are therefore observed to be call'd *Spirits*, as being otherwise incapable of *subsisting* in 'Advs, the *Prison* of *separated Souls*, as necessarily returning to their *natural Mortality* if they had nothing *Spiritual* in them; which is that *alone* from which they derive all the *actual Immortality* they can pretend to. Here therefore we have this glorious Champion of the *Catholick Church*, and the *Church* of his *Age*, fully of our mind, in opposition to the *Heresie* of *Apollinaris*. I might pursue this further, through the other Writers against that same *Heresie*, and to *lower Authorities* of *later Ages*; but I think what I have said sufficient, as being really the *best Authority*, and what ought to be the *Standard* of *future Ages*.

In truth, these Notions of $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ and $\piνε\upsilon\mu\alpha$, in the Sense now explained, seem to have been as notorious in the *Ecclesiastical* Disputes of these Ages, as any other *Technical Terms* derived from the *Scriptures*. The *Gnostical* Enthusiasts of all

23.
This Distinction
between
the Soul
and Spirit
supposed in
the Disputes
with the

Hereticks from the days of the Apostles themselves.

sorts insisted on them, and indeed grounded all their Pretensions to their *Gnosis* on their *Appropriations* of the *Spirit* to their own Parties. Indeed, they meant, by their *Gnosis*, that *Knowledge of Divine Mysteries*, which none could lay claim to, but *spiritual Men*, by the *Reasonings* of St. Paul himself, as well as of the *Mystical Platonists* and *Pythagoreans* of those Ages. On this they grounded their Claim to the *Pleroma*, the Place appropriated to the *Divine Seed*, which was no other than the *Spirit*. The *Pleroma* was indeed the same with *Heaven*, the Place of *Immortal Beings*, their *Æons*, the same with the *Platonick Idea*, as *Tertullian* observes. In Opposition to the *Emptiness*, and *Appearance*, and *Falshood* of *Sublunary Beings*. And they thought it the Office of *Horus* to keep out all *Psychical Men* from thence, as not being *θεωδέε-
τας εἰς ζῶντες αἰώνιον*. To such, if they be-
have themselves well, they allowed a Place of Reward in the *Status Medietatis*, between the *Pleroma*, and the Place of the *Punishment* of the *Devils*, that is, between *Heaven* and *Tartarus*. The third sort of *Men*, the *Choical*, of the *χῆς*, the *Dust* of the *Earth*, in the *Greek Interpreters*, they thought *extinguished* with their *Bodies*, and therefore had no Concern to provide a *future State* for them. So *Tertullian*, on Pretence of defending the *Spirit* of *Monta-*
nus

nus and his *Prophetesses*, calls the *Catholicks* *Psychicos*, as *destitute* of the *Spirit*, because they did not allow of his *Paraclete*. And this seems to have been the Plea of the *Enthusiastick Hereticks*, from the days of the *Apostles* themselves. St. *Jude* seems plainly to allude to them, v. 19. Οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδοκίζοντες ἑαυτοὺς, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. He intimates the *Horus*, by which they thought their Station in the *Pleroma* distinguished and separated from the *Status Medietatis*, the Station by them assigned to the *Catholicks*, as being only *Psychici*, and *destitute* of the *Spirit*, of which themselves boasted. On the contrary, St. *Jude* implies the ἀποδοκίσιμος, to be only in their own Fancies, and *denies* their Claim to the *Spirit*, turning the Charge of being *Psychical* on themselves, which they had fixed on the *truly Catholick Church*. He grants therefore the ἀποδοκίσιμος, to the *truly Spiritual*, and that the *Psychical* have no *Right* to it. Only he denies the *appropriating* Application of those great *Rights* to *them*. He asserts, as he very reasonably might, the *truly Apostolical Spirit* to the genuine *Sons* and *Successors* of the *Apostles*; which did, in *Consequence*, overthrow their *Pretensions* to the *Spirit*, who opposed and undermined the *Doctrine* of the *Apostles*, and left them in the State of being only *Psychical*. And

pursuant

The Distinction between

pursuant to this Claim of the *Spirit* to the
Catholick Apostolick Church, in Opposition
 to these *false Brethren*, the *true Church*
 challenged also *true Gnosis*, as the excellent
Dr. Hammond has observed in many places,
 but especially in that famous Passage of
St. Paul, where he styles the contrary Boasts
 of the Adversaries *Ψευδώνομον γνῶσιν*. This
 the *Gnosticks* themselves understood as so
 designed against their own Cause; as that
 they therefore *denied* the Authority of *this*
Epistle, as we are assured by *Clemens Alex-*
andrinus, Strom. ii. p. 165. This I take
 for a certain Conviction of their Mistake,
 who will allow nothing in that *Key* for un-
 derstanding the Writings of the *New Testa-*
ment, so much insisted on by that very
pious, as well as *learned*, Doctor, whose
 Memory ought always to be had in Ho-
 nour in *our Church*, to which he was so
 great an Ornament. And accordingly
Clemens Alexandrinus himself challenges
 the Title of the *ἀληθὴς γνῶσις*, to the *truly*
Catholick Church. So far the *truly Ortho-*
dox Christians, ev'n of *those Ages*, were
 from disapproving this *Language*, and these
Opinions, ev'n of the *Innovators them-*
selves. In *that* indeed they did differ
 from them, that they did not make the
Divine Ingredient connatural to the *Soul*, at
 its *first Constitution*; and that the *Ortho-*
dox condemned the *Hereticks* for believing
 it

it *connatural*, and look'd on *this Belief* of theirs, as the *Characteristick* of their *Heresie*. And the *Consequence* hereof would then be, that the *Catholicks* must believe the *Soul mortal* in its own *Nature*, when they did not believe this only *Principle* of *Immortality connatural* to it. And withal, that the *Doctrine* which made the *Principle* of *Immortality connatural* to the *Soul* in its *first Essential Constitution*, and thereby made the *Soul naturally Immortal*, was then taken for *Heretical* in those *first Heresies*, which *first* made a discession from the *Catholick Communion*, immediately after the decease of the *Apostles*. And here is also an *Authority*, far beyond that of *Cartes*, proving something *distinct* from *Spirit*, *Matter* and *Motion*. These *Holy Fathers* believed the *Soul* it self to be so. And the *modern Peripateticks* had the same *Opinion* of *Material Forms*. Nor has that *Philosopher* demonstrated the contrary, that there cannot be an *active substantial Principle*, distinct from *Matter*, yet depending on *Matter in esse, in fieri, in operari*, and which must accordingly be dissolved on the *dissolution* of that *Matter* on which it depends. If *Distinction* of *Conceptions* would do it, that would as well prove the *separate Subsistence* of the *Divine Attributes* which do as little include each other in their mutual *Conceptions*, as the *Conception* of
a mate-

a *material Form* can be pretended to include the *Conception of Matter*.

24.
The Do-
ctrine of
the natural
Mortality
of the Soul
thus ex-
plained,
can have
no ill in-
fluence on
our present
Practice.

It is withal a farther Consideration for removing *Prejudices* against this *Doctrine*, that it leaves all *Obligations*, relating to *Practice*, as firm as it finds them. *Criminals* can derive no Confidence for *persevering* in their ill Courses from the *natural Mortality* of their own Souls whilst they are withal assured that they shall be *actually Immortal*. No more than they can promise their *Bodies* any ease in their *Eternal Torments* after the Day of *Judgment*; because their *Bodies* are, without question, *Mortal naturally*, if God had been pleased to leave them to their own *Nature*. His *actually immortalizing* their *Bodies* to *Punishment*, makes their Case as formidable in that regard, as if they had been *Immortal* of their own *Nature*. The Case is the same with their *Souls*. Their *actual Immortality* is also sufficient for *eternizing* their *Pain*. And their *actually Subsisting* after the *Death* of their *Bodies*, exposes them to the same *Sufferings*, ev'n in the *interval* between their *Death* and *Resurrection*, as their *natural Immortality* would. So that their *Sufferings* will be as long on *these*, as on the *more received*, Principles. Thus none who are concerned in these *Punishments* can gather any *security* to themselves from this *Doctrine* of the *Souls natural Mortality* thus
ex-

explain'd. All that can be pretended, is, That *fewer* will be *concerned* in them than are commonly conceived to be. And that, methinks, should rather be taken for an *Advantage* than an *Inconvenience*, if none be hereby tempted to *believe* themselves *secure*, when really they are not so. And of that there is no danger. They who are *really secure*, by these *Principles*, are they who *never heard*, nor *could hear*, of the *Gospel*: All they, in *general*, who lived before the *new Revelation* mention'd by *St. Paul*, obliging *all Men*, from *that time* forward, of whatsoever *Place* or *Nation*, to *receive* the *Gospel* as soon as it should be sufficiently *promulged* and *proposed* to them. But this is no *concern* of the *Age* we live in. Nor is it possible that any one *now* can hear of the *Doctrine* I am speaking of, without *hearing* of the *Gospel* too, because it is urged as the *Doctrine* of the *Gospel*. This being so, there will follow this, I think, unavoidable *Dilemma*: They who *never* heard of this *Doctrine*, cannot possibly make any *ill use* of it; and they who *do* hear of it, must also hear of the *Gospel*, and therefore cannot promise themselves any *security*, if they still *continue* refractory, for that very *Reason*, because they must be supposed to have *heard* of the *Gospel*. They therefore can promise themselves, by these *Principles*, *no Security* at all. How then
can

can they be flattered into a *false security*? Their only *true Security* is, to be *warned* of their *Danger* before it be irremediable; and that will best appear by letting them see how far *their Case* is from the *Case of them*, who can expect any *relief* from this *Doctrine* of the *natural Mortality* of our *Human Souls*. Where then is the *danger*? where is the *abuse*, that *can* be made of this *Doctrine*, by them that *hear* it and impartially *consider* it? I can foresee none that can be, by any *rational Consequence*. And no *rational* Person will make any responsible for *Consequences* that *himself* believes *irrational*.

25.
The Im-
mortali-
zing Prin-
ciple was
generally
believed
no ingre-
dient in the
Nature of
the Human
Soul, a-
mong the
Heathens
themselves.

The great *difficulty* of this *Question* lies in this, whether the *immortalizing Principle* was originally *designed* by *God* for an *Ingredient* of *Human Nature* in general? or, whether it was *intended* by *God himself*, as a *separable Favour* for *some Men*, which he reserved in his own arbitrary *Pleasure*, whether he would confer it on *others*? If it had been an *essential Ingredient* in *Human Souls*, they must *all* of them indeed be *necessarily Immortal*. And the *Consequence* would be, That, if their *separate State* be a state of *Rewards* or *Punishments*, those *Rewards* and *Punishments* must likewise be *Eternal*. But there were but *few* of this *Opinion*. The *popular Heathens* believed *only* their *first Ancestors* to have been *Gods*,
their

their *next* to have been *Heroes* or *Demi-gods*, and the *later* Generations to have been *pure Men*. Unless the *supreme Being* were *pleased* (ev'n in the *degenerous Ages*) to confer the *nobler Principle* on some choice *Favourites*, as *Princes*, or other remarkable *Benefactors* of *Mankind*. Thence came the *divine Honours* to *Founders* of *Colonies*, to remarkable *Princes*, to the *Roman Emperors* in course, to *Philosophers*, especially those that were *Theurgical*, and *Favourites* of *Princes*, as *Caligula's Sisters*, and *Hadrian's Antinous*. The *Pythagoreans* also seemed of the same Opinion, if we may judge of their Sentiments by the *Golden Verses*. They there own their *Immortal Gods*, their *Heroes*, and their *Earthly Dæmons*, of which their *Immortal Gods* alone were supposed to have the *Immortalizing Divine Principle*, which entitled them to *Heaven*, the place of the *Immortal Gods*. The *Heroes* were confined to the *Air*, and the *Earthly Dæmons* to the *Earth*. But these differences seem only imputable to the *different use* of their *Free-wills* in keeping the same *Divine Principle* more or less *pure*. That qualified them for a *higher* or a *lower* Region, as giving them more or less of the *Wing* which enabled them to mount *higher* or *lower*. So we must understand them to reconcile them with the *Platonists*, who followed the *Pythagoreans* in their *Theology*.
For

For *Plato's Timæus*, is only the Doctrine of *Timæus Locrus* the *Pythagorean*, as appears by comparing both their Books still extant. And indeed, both of these suppose *Human Souls* to be of a *Cælestial Original*, and to have a tendency thither again. Which must be on account of this *Superiour Divine Principle* which themselves own for the only *Wing* that can mount them thither. Hence their Discourses concerning the descent of their Souls by some *Signs* of the *Zodiack*, and their return by other *Signs*. Plainly implying, that the *Exile* of Souls was from the *Sun*, as the *κεκτὴς* of Νῆς or Λόγος, the upper and *Diviner* part of the *Soul*, whose proper Course was in the *Zodiack*, which is in *Heaven*, properly so call'd, in a contradiction to those Regions which were reckon'd as *ἐσχατῖαι*, or *Subcælestial*. So *Macrobius* in his excellent *Commentary* on *Tully's Somnium Scipionis*. And *Porphyrus* makes this Opinion as old as *Homer* himself, one of the eldest Fountains of *Greek Traditions*. For so he expounds the Fragment *de antro Nympharum* of that Prince of Poets. And indeed very ingeniously, so as to make it probable that *Homer* himself might mean so. And indeed *Hesiod*, the *Cotemporary* of *Homer*, reckons the like degrees of the degeneracy of Souls from their first Original. So that, by this Account, all Souls were supposed to have this *Divine Principle*

Principle connatural to them. And these degrees of their separate state would only answer the πλεεργήσεις, the flagging of this Divine Wing, occasioned by the Corporeal Faculencies, contracted by them in their preceding Lives. Nor did these general Accounts hinder, but that particular Persons, even in the later more degenerate Ages, might raise themselves above the ordinary pitch of their Coævals, by a better Use of their own Free-will, and by Purgations of these worldly Pollutions. The Mysteries were thought one Expedient for clearing Souls of the βέβηλα, as Plato calls it, of Matter, which clogged the Wings, and added to the load that was to be raised by them. Philosophy was thought another, for subduing the Passions, those ἥλοι, the Nails of the Soul to Matter, as the same Plato calls them, and by spiritualizing their Souls by an ἐπιστροφή, that is their word, to Divine and Immaterial Objects, the Heavenly Beings; and Mathematicks, to which they also ascribed much for facilitating their return, because they also were separate from Matter. Besides the two great changes of the Annus Magnus, of the Platonick revolution, which was to restore all things to the same state wherein they were at first (that was their ἀποκατάστασις) restored in course, two great External Purgations. As the common Year has a Winter wherein the moist Principle

H

ciple

ciple prevails, and a *Summer* wherein the *hot* is predominant ; so every *Platonick Year* was thought to bring with it a *Revolution* of *Inundations* and *Conflagrations*, both of them of a *Purgative* Nature. Indeed, all their ordinary *Lustrations* were by those Elements of *Water* and *Fire*. Withal there are the *intermediate* Purgations of the *fiery Rivers* mention'd by *Plato* in his *"Advs.* For these also he thought *Purgative*, but in a *greater* or *lesser* time, according to the *degrees* and *aggravations* of the contracted *Pollutions*. But those could be only for the *Time* that the *Souls* so *purged* were supposed *not* to be in other *Bodies*. Thus there were provided *Purgatives* that might, in course, fit *Souls* for the *beginning* of a new *Revolution*. They who were *willing* to *purge* themselves, might, by the good *Use* of their own *Free-will*, gain *Heaven sooner*, and enjoy it *longer*, at least, to the *end* of that *great Year* wherein they were born : But they who were *not* willing to *purge themselves*, if they were to be *purged* by the now-mention'd external *involuntary Purgations*, they could have no hopes of *Heaven immediately* after their *Death*, till they had undergone the *Purgations* to which they were *condemned* by the *Governors* of *"Advs.* if their *Crimes* were of that nature as to be indeed capable of a *Purgation*. — Indeed, that could *not* be expected, unless the *Crimes* of

of all the *Transmigrations* they were to undergo through the whole *Platonick Year* proved *expiable*. But *Plato* owned that some Crimes were *ἀνίκατα*. If this were simply true, such *Souls* could *never* expect a *Restitution*, but must be *lost* for ever, as to that *Divine Celestial Life* for which they were at first designed. So the *Revolutions* would *not* restore things to the same state wherein they were *before*. And there must be *new Souls* sent down in their stead in the *next Revolution*. And this variety must, in an infinite number of *Revolutions*, make a great *change* in the *Uniformity* by which they conceived each *Revolution* should be transacted. For avoiding this, they might own a *greater Purgative Virtue* in the *Revolutional Conflagration*, than in the ordinary *Fires* of *Advs.* This Expedient might fit *all* to act their Parts *again* in the *new Scene*, when the *Wicked* as well as the *Good* were thus at last to receive their *Expiation*. And so it must be, if *Saturn* was again to govern in the *Golden Age*, and the *Titans* and the *Giants* were to act the Parts they had done *formerly*. They must all in course be dismissed from their *Chains* and *Confinement* to *Tartarus*. This is the *Consequence* of the *Immortality* of *Human Souls* on this *Hypothesis*, that *no* part of the *Divine Seed* might perish finally, if all *Human Souls* were thus far, at least, believed to be

The Distinction between

of a *Divine Extraction*, not as the Notion of *Divine* might entitle them to *infinite Perfection*, but as it might, at least, entitle them to *Immortality* and *Heaven*, as *ἀνὲν ἐόντες* and *Ὀλύμπια δέματ' ἔχοντες* are both of them *Epithets* of *Gods*, in this *lower* Notion, in the most ancient *Poets*. These Notions of the *Traditional travelling Philosophers* seem to have influenc'd *Origen*, in deriving our *Human Souls* into *Earthly Bodies* from a state of *Præexistence* in *Heaven*; and in allowing a *Purgation* of *damned Spirits*, and the *Devils* themselves, in the *Fire* of the *Conflagration*; and in making all purely *Human Souls* equal in this Claim to *Immortality*. He might possibly have learned them from those *Heathen Authors* whom *Porphry* pretends to have been his Guides in his *Mystical Interpretation* of the *Scriptures*. See *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. vi. 19.*

26.

The Primitive Christians disliked the Doctrine of the natural Immortality of the Soul, in Origen and others; and reasoned on Principles inconsistent with the belief of it.

However, among the *Christians*, this Doctrine of *Origen* was taken for very singular. Nor did the great Authority of the *Man* recommend it to many among them. They generally condemn'd it in *Plato* himself. They generally took it for a *Maxim* in Arguing, That whatever had a *Beginning*, could not be necessarily or naturally *Immortal*. On this Principle, they owned none *Immortal* but *God* Himself: No, not the *Angels*. So far they were from admitting the *Cartesian Principle*, That every *substantial Principle* of

of *Motion*, distinct from *Matter*, must thus be a *Spirit*, and *Immortal* in its own *Nature*. So far, even from the Doctrine of the modern Schoolmen, from the *Arabian Peripatetic* Philosophy. In truth, the *Heathens* themselves were not so Unanimous in it. *Plutarch* himself gives the *Mortality* even of the *Demons* themselves, for a Cause of the cessation of some Oracles. And *Aristotle* makes the immortal Soul *ὑπάρχον*, from without, as not ingredient in the constitution of Mankind in general, very agreeably to our *Scriptures* and *Fathers*, now described. I do not mention those *Heathens* who were not favourable to *Religion*. The *Apostle* himself speaks agreeably to this Reasoning : Ὁ μὴ ἔχων ἀθανασία, 1 Tim. vi. 16. as being the ἀποθανάτις from whom all, that will pretend to *Immortality*, must derive it, not from their own *Nature*. It is another Principle with them, That nothing that is possible can be *Immortal*. And they charge the *Platonists* with being inconsistent with themselves, when they make *Human Souls* *Immortal* in their own *Nature*, and yet make them imprisoned in *Bodies*, and subject to all those other *Infelicities* that follow thereupon. They accordingly prove from *Scripture*, that the *Soul* of the rich Man in the *Parable*, must have been *Corruptible* and *Corporeal*, because he suffered the Torments there mentioned. At least, that it could

The Distinction between

not be *Immortal* in its own *Nature*. They thence *disprove* the *Immortality* of the *Heathen Gods* themselves, because of their *sufferings*, owned and commemorated by their own *Worshippers*. How then could they consequently own the *natural Immortality* of *damned Souls*, when yet themselves believed them liable to such exquisite *Torments*, even from *corporeal Fire*? And that, as well in a *separate* state, as when they were again to be reunited to their *Bodies*. These the *Christians* took for *self-evident Principles* that could not be *denied* then, whatever their later *Successors* think of the same *Principles*. Accordingly they condemn these *same Doctrines* in the *Gnosticks*, those *earliest* of *Hereticks*, that they made their own *Souls naturally Pneumatical*, and consequently *Immortal* of their own *Nature*. And yet owned themselves liable to such *sufferings* as required such difficult *Contrivances*, as themselves pretended for their own *restoration*. So they upbraid them with the *sufferings* of the *Sophia*, the *Heavenly Aeon* in the *Pleroma*, as utterly *inconsistent* with that *Divinity* of *Nature* which they ascribed to her. Yet those very same *sufferings*, by their *Principles*, gave occasion for all that *Pneumatical Seed* which they thought propagated in this *lower World*, for whose *reduction* to the *Pleroma* their whole *Hypothesis* was fitted. Nor could they

they also be of an *immortal Nature*, if *sufferings* be an Argument to the contrary. And for this same reason, the *Catholick Church* of *that Age* could not believe the *separate Souls Immortal* in their own *Nature*, because they believed *ill Souls* under such *sufferings*, and that from a *corporeal Agent*, the *Fire of Hell*. I know very well, that *both* are believed *now*: both that our *separate Souls* are *immortal* in their own *Nature*; and that they are, notwithstanding that *capable* of those same *Punishments* from that same *Fire*. And I have mention'd the *Concessions*, of that *Nature*, among the *Heathens*, that *might*, and probably *did*, dispose them *afterwards* to believe these two *Assertions reconcileable*, who had a reverence for the *Authority* of the *Heathen Philosophers*, as the *Gnosticks* even then had. I only say, That this *Reasoning* could not have been admitted by the *Catholick Church*, who differed from the *Doctrine* of those *Philosophers* in this very *particular*; and who *confuted* them in things of the *greatest Importance*, relating to their *Popular Gods*, by this *Principle*, That whatever was *passible*, could not, for that *Reason*, be *Immortal* in its own *Nature*; because *Passion* naturally tended to *dissolution*. This *Principle* they took for so *self-evident*, as that they made it a *Criterion* for *Gods* and *Æons*. And they insisted on it as a *Characteristick* in opposi-

tion to both the *Heathen Philosophers*, and their own *Gnostick Hereticks*. They could not therefore admit the modern reconciliations of *Passibility* with *natural Immortality*. The same is also supposed in their deriving all *Immortality* both of the *Soul* and *Body*, from the *πνεῦμα*. They could not have done so, if they had not believed that the *Soul* alone was of its own *Nature Immortal*.

27.
The Im-
mortality
of the Soul
is a Reve-
lation of
the Gospel.
And there-
fore not ca-
pable of
being prov-
ed by Rea-
son, from
the Nature
of the Soul
it self.

In truth, the *Doctrine* even of the *Soul's actual Immortality*, seems not to have that *Evidence of Reason or Tradition* for it, as not to need a *new Revelation* of the *Gospel*, for recommending it to the *Universal Belief* of *Mankind*, at least with that *assurance* as was requisite for the *Practice* which *Religion* requires, *pursuant* to the *Belief* of it. At least as to the giving us that *immortal Life* in *Heaven*. That I take to be the true *Importance* of those words of the *Apostle*:

Συγκακοπάθεσον τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ δύναμιν θεῶ, τῷ σώσαντι ἡμᾶς, ἢ καλέσαντι κλήσει ἁγία· ἔ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ κατ' ἰδίαν πρέσβειον, ἢ χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ πρὸς χρένων αἰωνίων· φανερωθεῖσαν ὅτι νῦν διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάνειαν τῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, καταργήσαντι μὲν τὸ θάνατον, φωτίσαντι ὅτι ζωὴν ὅτι ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ,
2 Tim. i. 8, 9, 10.

Ἀφθαρσία and *ἀθανασία* are the same thing in the *Reasonings* of this same *Apostle*, 1 Cor. xv. The *Life* therefore that is joined with it, must be that which

which is *Immortal*, at least in *Fact*. This is said $\phi\omega\tau\iota\zeta\epsilon\delta\alpha\iota$ in the Gospel, and that by *Christ*. Plainly alluding to the *Inheritance incorruptible, that fadeth not away, of the Saints in light*. And this *Immortality* being from the *Spirit* (as I have already shewn) which is the *Spirit of Christ*, and which is accordingly given in our *Saviour's Baptism* as the only *ordinary Means* appointed by our *Saviour Himself* for our *receiving* it at *first*; Who can doubt but that our *Right* to an *immortal Happiness in Heaven* must *commence* from the time of our *Baptism*? That is imply'd by the name of $\phi\omega\tau\iota\sigma\mu\delta\varsigma$ as used for *Baptism*, not only by the *earliest Fathers*, but by this our *Apostle* himself in his *Epistle to the Ebrews*. But our state before *Baptism* is represented as a state of $\sigma\kappa\acute{o}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in opposition to the *Baptismal* $\phi\omega\varsigma$, of $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$ in opposition to the *Spirit* as it is styled $\nu\epsilon\varsigma$, and particularly of $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\omicron\iota\alpha$ in opposition to the $\gamma\kappa\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ the *knowledge of Mysteries, or Divine Secrets*, which was taken for the *Gift of the Spirit*, and therefore appropriated to the *Spiritual Man*, 1 Cor. ii. 15. These are the *deep things of God*, ver. 10. the *things of God*, ver. 11. the *things which are freely given to us of God*, ver. 12. the *mind of the Lord and of Christ*, ver. 16. which the *Psychical Man* receives not, ver. 14. but the *Spirit of God*, any more than any one can know the things of a *Man*, save the *Spirit* of

The Distinction between

of a *Man* which in him, ver. 11. because they are *spiritually* discerned, ver. 14. The *Immortality* therefore of the *Soul*, at least in *Heaven*, is here plainly supposed *not* to be known without *Divine Revelation*. Which could not be admitted as true, if there were *Reasons* that could prove it *actually* true, if it could be proved by *Reasons* drawn from the Nature of the *Soul*, as known to us in this *Life*, *antecedently* to *Divine Revelation*. Those *Reasons* would make it *known* to them who never had *heard* of *Revelation*, if the *Reasons* were so *evident* as our *Adversaries* pretend. But, proceeding on the *Principles* already insisted on, it is indeed a *Subject* of *Divine Revelation*, and could *not* have been otherwise *known* with that *certainty* that might support the *Practice* which *Religion* expects in *consequence* of it. *Nature* alone is not sufficient to make the *Soul* *Immortal* without the *Spirit*, which *God* was at *liberty* to *give* or *refuse* till he was *pleased* to *promise* it. And this *Promise* is the *mind* of *God*, and can no more be *known* without the *Revelation* of the *Spirit*, than the *mind* of a *Man* can be discovered by any other *Man*, without the intervention of the *Spirit* of the *Man*, whose *Mind* it is. This *Spirit* therefore is the $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma\ \delta\omicron\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\alpha$ so celebrated throughout the whole *New Testament*, as well as in *this place*. And it is call'd a *Gift* for that very reason, that we might thereby

thereby understand that it is not *due* to our *Human Nature*. And χάρις, because it is designed for *Favourites* of God, not for such as can lay no other *claim* to Divine *Favour*, besides that *general* one, of their being created by God. This being admitted to *peculiar favour*, is, in the *Hebrew* Idiom, expressed by *finding favour in the sight of God*, which is the same with εὐρεῖν χάριν in the *Greek*. And they who do so, are the fairest *Candidates* for such *Gifts*, as are taken for the *peculiar* Indications of any *Princes Favour*. This seems to be the *meaning* of the *Apostles*, and the *Apostolical Writers*, when they wish and congratulate the *Increase* of this χάρις to the *Churches* and *Persons* to whom they write. They mean the *Gifts* and *Graces* of this *Heavenly Spirit*, which from this χάρις are call'd χαρίσματα. So the *Blessed Virgin* is said to be κεχαριτωμένη when she was *overshadowed* by the *Spirit*. So χάρις and Ἀλήθεια are said to be given by *Christ*, in opposition to the *Law* given by *Moses*. Because the *Apostle* tells us expressly, that the *Spirit* was not given by the *Works of the Law*, but by the *Obedience of Faith*. It is there call'd Ἀλήθεια, not in contradistinction to Ψεῦδος, (as when it is opposed to *opposite Christian Communion*) but to the Σκιά, the *visible Symbol* of the *Schechinah*, which represented the *Spirit* in the *Legal Consecrations* of the *Tabernacle* and

and the *Temple*. As the *Sun* in the *Firmament* is call'd the *true Sun*, in opposition to a *Parhelius* in the *Clouds*, or in a *River*. And this name of *χάρις* is given it to shew, that, as none of the *external ritual Works* of the *Law* did *deserve* it, so neither did they *confer* it. So that *God* was still at perfect *liberty* whether he would confer it on the *Legally Righteous*, notwithstanding the *Obligations* he had been pleased to lay upon himself by his *Legal Covenant*. So far it is from being supposed *due* to the *rest of Mankind*, who could pretend no *Covenant* with *God* at all, not even that of the *Law*. This therefore being the *Principle of Immortality*, but not *natural* to *Mankind* in *general*; it must follow, that the *Souls of Mankind* (which cannot be *immortalized* but by this *Spirit*) cannot be *immortal* in their own *Nature*, by this *Reasoning* from *Scripture* and *Catholick Tradition*. It follows also, that even this *actual Immortality* could not be *actually known*, till *God* was *pleased*, by the *Revelations* of the *Gospel*, to *discover* his *actual* design of *giving* us his *Immortalizing Spirit*.

28. And that this was really the *Case*, appears farther, in that the *Doctrine* of the *Sadducees* was not *condemned* by any *publick Sentence* of the *Jewish Church*, as certainly it would have been if it had been *inconsistent* with *the Immortality of Human Souls*, yet) *knew* of no *Divine Revelation* that might assure them of it.

any

any *Divine Revelation* of the *Old Testament*. At least, if it had been so in the *Opinion* of the *Jewish Sanhedrin*. What the *Doctrine* of that *Sect* was, *St. Luke* assures us, That they denied the very being of either *Angel* or *Spirit*, *Act. xxiii. 6*. And what is the meaning of *Spirit* here, as it is joined with *Angel*, is manifest from what has been already observed. It is that *Immortalizing Spirit* which makes us *ἰσαγγέλους*, that is, *Immortal*, and intitled to *Heaven*, as well as the *Angels* are. That same *Spirit* indeed, by which the *Angels* themselves are entitled to *Immortality* and their *οἰκητήριον* in *Heaven*, as being themselves *πνεύματα πονηρίας*, or *δαιμονίου*, by their participation of that *Spirit*. By which *Christ* himself is said to be the *Head* of *Angels*, and *Principalities* and *Powers*, as he is said to be the *Head* of *Men*, as inhabited by that same *Spirit*, which is call'd the *Spirit of Christ*, and *Christ in us*, the hope of *Glory*, that is, of that *Glory* which is *Eternal* in the *Heavens*. This therefore obliged them to deny the actual *Immortalizing* of either *Angels* or *Human Souls*, when they denied them both that *Spirit* which could alone *immortalize* them. Yet they had their share in the *Sanhedrin*, and were qualified for the *High-Priesthood* it self. So far they were from the least note of *Infamy*, on account of their holding this *Opinion*. This could not have been, if the *Jewish Church*

Church had believed, even the *actual Immortality of Human Souls*, to have been as clear a *Revelation of the Old Testament*, as we believe it to be of the *New*. They therefore who lived *nearest to the time of those Texts*, which are *now* commonly produced for proving the *Immortality of the Soul*, did not so understand them as we do, at least were not so *assured* as we are, that the *Holy Ghost* did so *intend* them. How could this have been, if those *Texts* had been as *clear* in the *Case*, as we are sure those are of the *New Testament*? And how could they have been *clear*, if they, for whose *Capacities* the *Old Testament* was fitted, did not so *understand* them, nor found any received *Tradition* from their *Ancestors*, even *then*, which might oblige them to *believe* the *Doctrine* True; if *not* as the sense of those *Texts*, yet as a *Tradition* received originally from *God*, by their *Ancestors*? But really the *Opinions* then received among the *Jews*, are a sufficient conviction that they *knew* of no *Divine Revelation* concerning the *future State of the Soul*. Even the most *Spiritual Sect* of all, that of the *Essenes*, contented themselves with the *popular Opinions* received among the *Heathens*, concerning the *Elysian-Fields* in the *Fortunate-Islands* in the *Ocean*, if we may believe *Josephus*. What then may we expect from the *other Parties* whose *Genius* was more gross and sensual? The

Pha-

Bel. Jud.
II. xep 17
Græc. Ed.
Colon 1691.
p. 788.

Pharisees, the ἀρχαῖοι καὶ οὐκ ἀποστόλοις, as to the *Externals* of the *Ceremonial Law*, owned no other *Rewards* of the *Good*, but a *Transmigration* into good *Bodies*, nor any other *Punishments* of the *Wicked* than those of the *fiery Rivers*. Here was nothing, in either of these *Hypotheses*, but what they might have learned from the *Pagans* without any *Divine Revelation*; nothing that could be learned from any *Divine Tradition*, or any probable *Interpretation* of the *Scriptures*; nothing that argues any *Life*, even of the *Soul* it self, in *Heaven*; nothing that supposes it to *survive* the *World*, or to *continue* the same to the *Resurrection*; nothing that shews why it might not *then* be re-produced as well as the *Body*; nothing at all that would prove it *Immortal*, even in *their* *Opinion*, though it might survive the *dissolution* of our *gross organical Bodies*. Nor are their *received* *Notions*, alluded to in the *Gospel*, any better. The *Kingdom* of *Heaven* expected by *them*, was a *Kingdom* wherein they were to *eat* and *drink*; wherein they were to lie in *Abraham's Bosom*, alluding plainly to the *accubitus* of *Favourites* in the *bosoms* of their *Principals*, *then* received in their *Festival* *Entertainments*; a *marrying* and being given in *marriage*, as in the *Story* of the *Woman* married to the *seven Brethren*: a *restoring* the *Kingdom* to *Israel*, and a *sitting*
at

at the *right-hand* and the *left-hand* of the *Messias*, and their *ruling* of each other, as even the *Apostles* themselves expected till they were *better* informed by the *Revelations* of the *Gospel*. Nothing of all this supposed a state in *Heaven*, properly so called, or a state *Immortal*; but rather the *restoring* after a *Platonical* Revolution. Nothing therefore supposed a *Spirit* given to them *then*, that might either *raise* them from *Earth* to *Heaven*, or continue them to an *immortal* duration. They could not have been so *irresolute*, and so different among *themselves*, and so exactly agreeable to the *Opinions* of those who did *not* so much as *pretend* to *Revelation*, if themselves could have pleaded a *Divine Testimony*. The *Christians* were *not* thus uncertain, and divided, when this Matter was cleared by a *Revelation*, which was *acknowledged* by them all. What can be the reason of this *difference*, but that the *Revelation* of the *Gospel* was indeed the *first* Divine Revelation that settled it? This perfectly agrees with what I observed formerly, concerning the *warning* given to the *Heathens* by St. Paul. God *winked* at them, and *suffered* them to go on in their *own ways*, in their *omission* of what had otherwise been their *Duty* to the *Supreme Being*, till he *acquainted* them that it was his *Pleasure* to make them *Immortal*, and to judge them accordingly, which was first performed

formed by the *Revelations* of the Gospel. From *that time* therefore he *expected* their *compliance* under those *Pains* to which their *new-discovered Immortality* made them obnoxious.

The *Earliest Writers* suppose that God 29.
 did at first design this *Immortality* for all The Title to the Spirit, on account of the former Peculium, was perfectly arbitrary. So they who were not Proselyted into that Peculium seem to have been so long left to their natural Mortality.
Adam's Posterity (if he had not fall'n) by deriving this *immortal Spirit* to them. But whether he continued that design of making them *actually Immortal* since, is not so certain. The *Scripture* makes the choice of the *Peculium* perfectly arbitrary, which plainly supposes the *Favours* reserved for them not due to the *rest* of *Mankind*, on account of the *essential* Ingredients of their common *Humanity*. So it is described in the choice of the *Israelitish* Nation, rather than of any other Nation, to the Privilege of the *Peculium*; that it was not for any advantages themselves could pretend to above any other Nation; but because God was pleased to signalize them with those distinguishing *Favours*, for his own sake, and his great Name which was called upon them, by which he had appropriated them to his own *peculiar* Care; and on account of the *Promise* and *Covenant* he had been pleased to enter into with their *Patriarchal* Ancestors. Plainly supposing no such *Obligation* on account of their descent from *Adam*, the common Original of all other
 I Nations.

Nations. The same *liberty* is again asserted to God, in his Proceedings with the *Posterity* of the *first appropriated Patriarch, Abraham* himself. Even *his* Posterity were not all included in the *Peculium*, but only the Descendents of *Isaac*, not of *Ishmael*. And even in the seed of *Isaac*, *Jacob* alone was loved, and *Esau* hated, as being post-poned to his younger Brother, in this greatest of *National Favours*. For all these Passages are not to be understood of the *Persons* of these Patriarchs, but of the *Nations* who could pretend to them as their *Partriarchal Ancestors*. And I know not what can be clearer to this purpose, than the *opposition* insisted on by *St. Paul*, between the *first* and *second Adam*, between *Adam* our Progenitor and our Blessed Saviour : That in *Adam* all die, and that it must be from our Saviour the *second Adam* that all must derive their title to the *Life*, that is opposed to the *Death* derived from the former *earthly Adam*. We are said to be in *Adam*, whilst we have nothing but what we derive from *him*, as *essential* to our Constitution. And what that is, the same *Apostle* shews, when he calls it the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\ \zeta\omega\alpha$, in opposition to the $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \zeta\omega\omicron\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\nu$. The latter he makes only derivable from *Christ* as being the same with the *Image* of the *second Man*, the Lord from Heaven, $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\omega$, as the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ is the *Image* of that *Earthly Adam*,

Adam, from whom we receive all our properly *Human Nature*. This πνεῦμα is that alone which he acknowledges as a *Principle of Immortality*; that *Immortality*, at least, which can *Immortalize* our Happiness. And so far also of *Immortal Punishment*, as none are *actually Immortalized* by God to *Punishment*, beyond the *Principles* of their *Human Nature*, but they who had it in their *Power* to have been *Pneumatical*, if themselves had *pleased*. This *Spirit* is the *Spirit of Christ*, and is *given* by him alone in his *Baptism*, according to the *Reasonings* of the *New Testament*. This *Baptism* admits us into *one Body* with *Him*, which *Body* is his *Church*. The same *Baptism* is the *Laver of Regeneration*, and the *renewal of the Holy Ghost*. This therefore *alone* entitles us to be *in Christ*. So *St. Paul*, no doubt, understood it, when he speaks of those who had been *in Christ* before himself. His meaning was, That they had prevented him in their *initiation* into the *Church* by *Baptism*. Such are *in him*, as *Members* of his *Mystical Body* are said to be *in the Body* into which they are *incorporated*, as the *Branches* are said to be *in him* as the *Mystical Vine*. But principally as being *one Spirit* with *him*; and, as on *that* account, the *Scripture* owns that form of *speaking*, that *Persons* so *spiritually united* to him, are said to be *in the Spirit*, and to be *in the Αγία* as

well as the *Λόγος* in them. But the *Λόγος* derived from *Adam*, as his *εὐδωκία*, includes also the *πνοὴ ζωῆς*, the *flatus* in *Tertullian*, which is given to *all Nations*, according to the fore-mentioned passage of *Isaiah*, and the *Mystical Interpretation* of it received by the *Christians* from the *Jews*, which does not of *it self* make us *Immortal* (according to the sense of the *first Christians*) but only qualifies us for *Immortality* by an *Union* with the *Spirit*, which alone can entitle us to *actual Immortality*. Though we have *both*, without the *Spirit*, we are still in the *first Adam*, and bear his *Image only*, in *whom* we all die. Plainly therefore, by this *Scripture Hypothesis*, none can lay any *claim* to *Immortality*, but on account of the *Divine Spirit* actually received; or of the *Divine arbitrary Pleasure* actually *immortalizing* them for *Punishment* who *might* have had the *Spirit*, if they would have complied with the *Terms* on which they were to have received him. But the utmost extent of the *Mystical Body of Christ* (as it is described in the *New Testament*) extends no farther than the *Patriarchs* and *Prophets* of the *Old Testament*. Those *Patriarchs* especially, with whom *God* was pleased to make the *Patriarchal Covenant* for themselves and their *Patriarchal Seed*. Such were *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, and some few before them in an *ascending Line*. But those

those *Patriarchal Covenants* which entitled their *Posterity* to the *indefinite Favours* of the *Peculium*, were certainly *limited* to the *Descendents* of those *Patriarchs*, in *opposition* to all other *coæval Patriarchal Heads* of other Nations. So God *himself* explains his *own design*, when he tells us that he had *not dealt so with any other Nation*. And the *Notion* of their being a *chosen Nation*, and a *peculiar People*, implies the same. Those Nations therefore could lay no claim to the *Mystical Body* of *Christ*, till they were *admitted* into it by the *terms* of the *new Peculium*, and the *new Revelations* of the *Gospel*, which could not be till the *partition-Wall* was *broken down* by the *Cross* of *Christ*, and therefore could *concern* none that lived *before* the *Incarnation*. From the *Time* therefore of the *first choice* of even the *old Peculium*, to the *breaking down* of the *partition-Wall*, the *partition* must have *continued*, which made all Nations, *besides* the *Jews*, a *separate Body* from that which our *Blessed Lord* was pleased to take for his *own Mystical Body*. So long therefore they could not be *Members* of his *Body*, nor consequently could they be *in him*, whilst they were *not* in his *Church*, in the *largest Interpretation* of it. And not being *in him*, they could not be made *alive*. Not being *in him*, they must still remain in the *old Adam*, in whom they were *all* to *die*. Not being *in him*,
I 3 they

they could have no pretensions to his Spirit, which the *Apostle* admits for the only Principle of Immortality. They were still in the old Olive, which was wild by Nature. Nor could they partake of the sap and fatness of the good Olive, ἐλζαν and πιότῃα, Rom. xi. 17. before their ἐκέντησμός, their Inoculation into it. Nor could they do so, before their Incorporation into the Mystical Body of Christ by Baptism in their own Persons, who could lay no claim to be admitted into it, on account of any Covenant made with their Fore-fathers. Nor are they invited into the Church with any Encouragement of being accepted, till *Act.* xiii. So long therefore, by the Doctrine, even of the great *Apostle* of the Gentiles, the Gentiles are reckoned as in the old and former Adam, as bearing his Image, and as liable to that actual Mortality, which he perpetually owns as the necessary consequence of their being so. Nor had they hitherto any warning of their being preternaturally immortalized to Punishment, mentioned by St. Paul, *Act.* xvii. which might put them in fear of being concern'd in the great day of Judgment, on account of God's having recalled the permission formerly indulged to them, of walking in their own ways. These things seem so certain, by the Reasonings of the New-Testament, and the generally-received Sentiments of the Apostolical Age; that I can see

See no reason to doubt but that the *rest* of *Mankind* (who could plead no Title to the *Old* or *New Peculium*, nor were ever qualified for being *received* into either, by *Contrivances* of *Divine Providence*, not for want of any Diligence of their own) were still left to the *consequence* of that *Mortality* which was *natural* to them.

Yet, as I know how much the *contrary* 30.

Opinion has prevailed, so I am aware what *Proofs* of *Scripture* have been pleaded in favour of that *Opinion*. The *Texts* that favour our *Blessed Saviour's Design* of *Universal Redemption*, have been *thought*, thus far at least, *conclusive*, as to prove all *Human Souls* secure from *actual*

The Universality of those, who are mentioned as concerned in the Revelations of the Gospel, does not necessarily include any more of the Gentiles, than those who liv'd after the Preaching of the Gospel, and who had heard it preached to them.

Mortality, not only *genera singularum*, but *singulas generum*. But I know not how even themselves can *own* this to be the sense of those places, consistently with their own *Principles*. What is here supposed to be derived from *Christ*, is *opposed* to what is derived from *Adam*, and the *living Soul* is here instanced as the *particular* derived from *Him*. Yet even this *Particular* cannot be supposed derived from *Adam*, according to the *present Opinion* received from *St. Augustine*, which makes it immediately *created* by *God*. That therefore this *Soul* is reckoned as derived from *Adam*, can be

The Distinction between

understood no otherwise than as the *Soul* is an Ingredient in the *Humane Nature* as derived from *Him*, by *all* which we are said to *bear* his *Image*, as having all the same *natural* Ingredients in *us* as were in *Him* on account of the *Human Nature* which is common to us *both*, on account of an *univocal Generation*. If therefore *all* that we have *common* with *Adam* (no not even this *noblest* Ingredient of *all*) cannot *hinder* us from *dying* as we are in *Him*; it will follow that even *actual Immortality* cannot be derived from any thing that is *essential* to our common *Nature*. Plainly therefore, that *Image* of *God*, that *Man* from *Heaven*, which *St. Paul* ascribes to our *Blessed Lord*, is *preternatural* and *supernatural*, and not necessarily agreeing to *all* that agree in the same *Human Nature*. But the true design of such Passages, is, to *disown* such a *Confinement* under the *New Peculium*, as had been formerly under the *Old*, to *one* certain *Nation*. And, on the contrary, to declare *all Nations* qualified for being received into the *new Peculium*, without any obligation to *quit* their received *National Characteristics*, or to *incorporate* themselves into any one *particular Nation*, as they were *obliged* to do *before*. Withal, this *Universality* extended to all *particular Persons* who came any way to the *Knowledge* of the *Gospel*, after it was *promulged*: that *God* did as *sincerely*

cerely *design*, and *desire*, the *rewarding* of every *individual* Person, who *qualified* himself for the *favour*, by *receiving* it, and by *joining* himself in the *Communion* and *Society* of the *Authoriz'd* Preachers and Promulgers of it, as he *veraciously* intended the *Punishment* of them who were wanting to themselves in *not* receiving it, when sufficiently *proposed* to them, and who could *not* be prevailed on to *qualifie themselves* for *Eternal Rewards*, by *threats* of *Eternal Punishments*, in case they would not *qualifie themselves* for *Eternal Rewards*. These Notions of *Universality* are perfectly sufficient for the *design* of the *first* Propagators of the Gospel, to *oblige* all that *heard* them to *comply* with the *Terms* that were requisite to *entitle* them to the *Benefits* of the Gospel. This *design* did not any way *oblige* them to give their Opinion of *Predecessors* out of the *Old Peculium*, and before the *Terms* of the *New Peculium* were *settled* and *promulged*, with whom the *Preachers* of *that Age* had not any the least *concern*. Nor were they *concerned* in any of the *other* Disputes that were started in *that Age*. I have, on the contrary, shewn from the *Apostle's* own words, That the Case of the *Gentiles*, then *living*, was judged *different* from the Case of their *Ancestors*, even as to that *particular* instance, of their *Obligation* to *enter* into the *true Peculium*. How then can it be gather-

gathered, that the *Immortality*, which could only be expected from *Christ*, was ever intended for them who had never heard of *Christ*, nor of any *Obligation* incumbent on them to believe on *Him*, nor any hopes of being accepted by *Him*?

31.
There is no necessity, that all who died in Adam should be immortalized by Christ.

The words indeed of the *Apostle* are express: That as in *Adam* all die, so in *Christ* all shall be made alive, 1 Cor. xv. 22. *Πάντες* is the word used in both parts of the Sentence. But it may be easily referred to *Adam*, and to *Christ*; and, being so referred, that will not prove the *Event*, but only the *Condition* of Men, so long only as they are in *Adam*, and as they are in *Christ*. So the obvious meaning would be: That, as all who are in *Adam* die, so all who are in *Christ* shall be made alive. This may be very true, and is so by the Principles now mentioned. But it does not therefore any way imply, that all who were in *Adam* shall ever be in *Christ*, or shall therefore receive from *Christ* the Privilege of *Immortality*; which none can have, who does not receive it from *Him*. And, in truth, the concern of the Dispute was not, whether all Men simply, but whether they who were in *Christ*, should rise? This appears from the *Objection* of the *Hereticks*, who raised the Dispute, as we have it represented by the *Apostle* himself. Their Pretence was, That the *Resurrection* was past already, 2 Tim. ii. 18.

No

No doubt, on account of the *Baptismal Symbol* of rising out of the *Water*, by which our rising with *Christ* is both signified and stipulated. This *Resurrection* they understood of dying to *Sin*, and rising to *Righteousness*, as the *Apostle himself* does also elsewhere understand it, yet not so as to exclude the *Resurrection* of the *Body* also. But the *Hereticks* seem to have taken this advantage from that *Concession*: That, because that *Mystical Resurrection*, from *Sin*, was transacted in the *Soul*; there was therefore no need of extending the *Promise* signified by that *Symbol*, on *God's* part, further, of another, and a distinct, *Resurrection* of the *Body* also. This stating of the *Question* the *Apostle* also supposes in his *Reasonings* against these *Hereticks*. He also *Reasons* from *Baptism*, 1 Cor. xv. 29. Observing that the principal design of *Baptism* was purposely to assure us of that Article, of the *Resurrection* of the *Bodies*, which was then received with the greatest difficulty. So that he reckons the denial of that as an evacuation of our whole *Baptism*, as that which would make the profession of *Faith* required from *Catechumens*, as a qualification for their *Baptism*, useless; and the remission of *Sins*, which a valid *Baptism* was designed to expiate, also null, if the *Body* was to receive no benefit from the *Baptism*. That is the importance of his words: *Your Faith*

Faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins, ver. 17. This would, in the consequence, overthrow their own Notion of a *Resurrection* from *Sin*, if their *Baptism* had been *unavailable* for their *Expiation*. But the *Principle* on which this *Reasoning* proceeds, is, That the great *design* of *Baptism*, is to make us *one* with *Christ*, as well *Bodily* as *Spiritually*. So it is, that we are said to be *Baptized into one Body*, 1 Cor. xii. 13. That is, by the *Baptism* of *Water*, as well as we are *Baptized into one Spirit*, by the *superiour* part of the *Baptism* of the *Spirit*. And indeed we are *qualified* for our *Union* with *Christ* in the *Spirit*, by our being first made *one Body* with *Him*. So that this *lower Baptism* is *fundamental* to the *other*. And our *Union* in *Spirit* must fail, if we be not first made *one Body* with our *Lord*; which will *ruine* the *Union* pretended by these *Hereticks*, in case this *Bodily Union* should fail, which is so *fundamental* to all this *Reasoning* of the *Apostle*. This therefore being supposed, that we are made *one Mystical Body* with *Christ* in our *Baptism*: it will follow farther, that our *Bodies* are to be *invested* with all the *Privileges* of *his Body*. This must be understood as *Covenanted* on *Christ's* part, when we consider these *Baptismal Symbols*, not only as *Signifying*, but as *Covenanting, Symbols*, for Performance on *Christ's* part of what is *signified*, and therefore *covenanted* on *his*

his part. But the *Resurrection* of our Lord could be no *Mystical Resurrection* from Sin, because *He knew no sin*. It could therefore only concern his *Body*; and his *Soul*, no otherwise than *consequently*, as it was concerned in the Events of his *Body*. However, it was not even his *ψυχή*, but his *πνεῦμα*, which is supposed, in this *Reasoning* of the *Apostle*, as the Principle of *Immortality*. As for the *Resurrection* of our Saviour's own *Body*, that he lays down as a *Foundation* of his whole *Preaching*, and of his whole *Apostolical Office*, which was to be an *Authentical Witness* of the most memorable *Acts* of our Saviour, but particularly of his *Resurrection*, as has already been observed by others. So he, *ver. 14, 15*. Hence therefore he gathers farther, That if *Christ's Body* was raised, our *Bodies* must be raised also. Which *Reasoning* depends on this *Act* of *Christ* in *Baptism*, whereby he is pleased in that *Sacrament* to accept, and receive, our vile *Bodies* into a *Mystical Union* with his own *Body*, so as to oblige himself to treat them as if they had been indeed his own *Body*; and not to think any fruition of *Privilege* to his own *Body* complete, unless it be communicated to all others also, whom he has been pleased to admit to this honour of being accounted as his own *Members*. So he *Reasons* elsewhere, concerning the *Members* of this same
Mysti-

Mystical Body. That the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it : or one member be honoured, all the members rejoyce with it, 1 Cor. xii. 25, 26. So the Reasoning holds in relation to the Concern particular Members ought in Reason to have for all the fellow-members of their common Body. Which must certainly proceed more strongly concerning the Head, whose Concern, for observing the exact Rules of Reason and the Publick Good, must infinitely exceed that of any purely Human Members. But there is another Topick of Reasoning allowed in this Body, whereby a Possession of any Member of it, as representing the whole, is judged in Law sufficient to convey a Legal Right to all the other Members of the same Body, as being indeed judged a Legal Possession of all the other Members by such their Proxy, though they do not as yet enjoy the fruits of such their Legal Title. The same way as the Earnest-Penny in possession, conveys a Legal Title to all the remainder of the agreed Price. So we are said to be already set down in Heavenly places, Eph. ii. 6. because our Brethren of the Church Triumphant are already in possession of Heaven it self. So the Apostle Reasons from our Saviour's Resurrection to ours, as He is the first-fruits from the dead, ver. 23. As the Consecration of the first-fruits was judged

judged, in Law, to extend to the whole Harvest. And as he is the first-begotten from the dead. The Consecration of the First-born Consecrated the whole Families. And the Consecration of the Levites, in lieu of the First-born, was a Consecration of the whole Israelitish Body. Thus Baptism was *ἐν νεκροῖς*, ver. 29. as it gave them a security for the Resurrection of their dead Carcasses. They are elsewhere frequently, in this Dispute, call'd *νεκροὶ* simply without an Article. Nor does the Article add any new Emphasis, as some conceive; *ὁ νεκρός* does also signify a dead Carcase, though of a Woman, as in the Cases of Lucretia and Virginia. But all this Reasoning, grounded on our Baptism, can only concern those who are admitted to the Honour of Baptism. The Consequences are only true concerning such, That if Christ be risen, they must rise also; and that if they do not rise, neither can it be true that he is risen. For they only are his Members, and they only are the Harvest of which he is the First-fruits, nor are any other of the Family of which he is the First-born. Nor is it pertinent to this purpose to include any of the rest of Mankind, barely on that general Account alone of their having born the *εἰκών* of the first Adam. But it is very pertinent to the same purpose to include the generality of those who are in Christ by Baptism, lest otherwise the

He-

Dionys.
Hæc. Hist.
L. XI. l. 9.
p. 677.
Ed. Oxon.
& l. 13.
p. 684.
vid.

Hereticks might put it off as a *singular Case*, that the *Body of Christ* had been *raised*, as if none *besides* were concerned in it. And withal, that every *Individual Baptized*, professed *Christian* might, from this general Inference, be *assured* of the *Resurrection* of his *own Body*. This therefore I take for the true sense of this place, which does not any way imply, that *all*, who ever were in *Adam*, shall be *immortaliz'd* by *Christ*, without whom there can be no hopes of *actual Immortality*.

32.
The Apo-
stle inti-
mates,
that, in the
space be-
tween A-
dam and
Moses,
they, who
had not the
Spirit,
were left
to their
actual
Morta-
lity.

This sense also is confirmed by the like Expressions in the parallel place of *Rom. v.* There the *numbers* concerned in the *Death*, introduced by *Adam*, or the *Immortality* introduc'd by *Christ*, are said to be πολλοί, that is, of those who are concerned in the event of *actual Death* or *actual Immortality*. So, through the offence of one, many are said to be dead; and the grace of God, and the gift of Grace by one Man, *Jesus Christ*, to have abounded unto Many, ver. 15. And, As by one Man's Disobedience, Many were made sinners; so by the Obedience of one, shall Many be made Righteous, ver. 19. And that *all men* are not included, appears from ver. 14. where the βασιλεία of *Death* is confin'd to the space between *Adam* and *Moses*. As *Adam* was the first by whose sin *Death* descended on his Posterity, without any sin of their own, but as they sinned in him, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἡμαρ-
τησαν.

ἡμεῖς, v. 12. They are said *not to have sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression*. That is, not against a Law given to them as the Law concerning the forbidden Fruit was given to *Adam*, to be observed by *Adam*, not by his *Posterity*. The first Law given the *Peculium* to be observed by them in their *own* Persons, he reckons to have been that of *Moses*, which therefore he makes to have been the *first Epoch*, from whence a breach of Law, which might be judged *criminal* in them, was to be dated. So he reasons: *Sin is not imputed where there is no Law*, v. 13. That is, where the Law, against which the *Sin* is committed, is not in the power of the *Sinner*, whether he will keep or observe it. The Reasoning is the same as before: *where no Law is there is no transgression*, Rom. iv. 15. And the design seems to be, to make out this βασιλεία of *Death*, mention'd on the same occasion. It alludes, if I mistake not, to the αὐτὴ βασιλείον, *Wisd. i. 14.* another *Hebraistical* Author, about the same Age. Whether the *Apostle* derived the form of speaking from that place I cannot say. However that place alone is sufficient to shew that this form of Speech was *familiar* among such as the *Apostle* himself was, before his Conversion. Now by βασιλεία here, that *Lawful* form of *Monarchy* cannot be understood (which is opposed to *Tyranny*) as li-

mitted by Considerations of *Equity* and *Conscience*; but rather that very *form* which is by those called *Tyranny*, in regard of its *Arbitrariness*, though not of its *Usurpation*. This βασιλεία therefore of *Death*, thus explain'd, implies such a *Power* of him who *has the power of Death*, Ebr. ii. 14. as is *unavoidable* by him who is *obnoxious* to the sentence of *Death*, by any means in the *power* of the *Patient*. That is the *Case* of those who suffer by a *Law violated* not by themselves, but by *another*, who has a *power* of concluding them so far, at least, by his *own Acts*, as to *involve* them in a participation of the *Punishment*, however otherwise *innocent* in their *own Persons*. So it was in the *Case* of *Achan's Children*, and the first *Child* of King *David* by *Bathsheba*, and the *Posterity* of *Saul*, who were *punished* by the command of *God* himself for the *sins* of their *Ancestors*, to which they could not possibly have been *accessary*, by any *Contribution* of their *own*. The *Reason* therefore of *their* sufferings, was entirely derived from their being contained in their *Ancestors*, by the most antient *Patriarchal Right*, received then as a *Jus Gentium*, by the *Civiliz'd Nations*. And probably not without a *Divine Positive Constitution*, though too antient to be proved so, as being far *more* antient than the *Invention* of *Letters*, which were the only *means* by which

which it was possible that the *History* of the *Legislation* it self, could have been conveyed to *Posterity*. However it is most certain that the thing it self was thought *just*, because *God* himself required it, who deals with *Men* by the same Rules of *Equity* by which they regulate their dealings with each other, and therefore appeals even to themselves as *Judges* of the *Equity* of his own dealings with them. This therefore our great *Apostle* supposes to be the Case of the *Death* inflicted on *Adam's* *Posterity*, within the *space* now mentioned, before the *Promulgation* of the *Mosaic Law*, for a *Transgression* of a *Command* imposed on *Adam's* *Person*, which was no otherwise imputable to them than as they were, by this Rule of *Patriarchal Covenants*, included in him, and, on that account, chargeable with the *Sin* of the *Transgression* of a *Personal Command*: ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἠναπτόντο. But the Case was otherwise afterwards, when that *Law* was given, which was intended to be observed by every *Individual Person* of the *Posterities* concerned, as well as by their *Patriarchal Ancestors*. Here it was in the power of every *Individual*, by the use of his own *Free-will*, to entitle himself, as well to the *Rewards* of the *Observation*, as to the *Punishments* of the *Violation*, of that same *Law*. This Case therefore was the same with that of *Adam* himself, wherein

the *Power of Death* was not so *Absolute* and *Regal*, when it was in the *Power* of each *Free will* to exempt it self from the *Power* of the *captivating Tyrant*. Not so, when the *Fate* of the *whole Posterity* was to be determined by one *single Act* of the *Patriarchal Ancestor*, which, if it were an *evil one*, exposed them all to *Punishment*, whether they would, or no. Here therefore was no *avoiding* the *Punishment* so incurred. These therefore could have no *hopes* of *Immortality* by this *Reasoning* of the *Apostle*, as being wholly *determined* by the *single Act* of *Adam*. This *Case* continued from *Adam* to *Moses* in the *Posterity* of *Cain* and *Ham*, notwithstanding the different *Case* of *Seth* and some other particular *Patriarchs*. And the *Law* given by *Moses* was the *first Act* of *Divine Legislation*, as over a *Peculium*, after that given to *Adam*, that is mention'd in the *Scripture*, wherein *Life* as well as *Death* are proposed as *Obligations* to the *Duty* required by it, and which might therefore put them in *hopes* of that *actual Immortality*, which exceeded the power of their *Nature*, as a *Reward* of their *free Obedience*. Before, this very *Reasoning* of the *Apostle* seems to imply that the greatest numbers of those, who lived within that *Period*, were left to the consequence of their *natural Mortality*, in being abandon'd to the uncontrollable *Power of Death*.

as a *King*. This therefore is a clear conviction that the *universal* Clause, used in the same Chapter, in the same Case, ought not so to be understood, as to contradict this plain *Doctrine* of the Apostle: nor indeed does it any way seem *inconsistent* if fairly understood. The words are these: *Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation: even so by the Righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life, v. 18.* It is most certain, that all individual Men have not the benefit of *actual* Justification by the Righteousness of Christ, in the same latitude of signification wherein the word is taken when they are said to be liable to the condemnatory sentence of *Death* for the Sin of Adam. It is therefore much more agreeable to the Apostle's design, to understand the *Universality* in the sense now explain'd, of those who accept of the Gospel upon their hearing it preached. So that the *Parity* refers rather to the Case, than to the equal *Universality*, of the Persons concerned in it. Such *Universal* Particles are to be limited according to the exigency of the Subject in the Scripture. So the Apostle concerning the day of Judgment, *Then shall every man have praise of God, 1 Cor. iv. 5.* His meaning is not, That every man shall have praise of God, who shall then appear before that most exact and impartial Tribunal; but,

That every *Man* shall have it, whose *Cause* shall then be *judged* to deserve it. And it is usual, even in ordinary *Conversation*, *not to mention* such *limitations* as every *Person* concern'd would have judged *unnecessary* to the *design* of the *Speaker*, that is, in such *Cases* wherein he had otherwise so plainly signified his *Mind*, as that he could *not* mean his words in the *unlimited* sense, if he would speak *consistently*.

33.
The Light
that en-
lightens
every Man
that com-
eth into
the World
is the $\Pi\upsilon\omicron\eta$
not the
 Πνεῦμα .

There is another *Text*, which may be thought favourable to prove that the *Spirit* is given to every *particular* by *Christ* himself. Which, if this be the true meaning of it, will prove that all are *actually immortalized*, and must therefore be concerned in the *general Judgment*. It is this, *That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world*, S. *Joh.* i. 9. The words are spoken of the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{C}$, and therefore of our Blessed Saviour, as to his *Divine Person*, as he is that *second Adam*, and the *Lord from Heaven*. So it is, that he is concerned in this *additional* perfection of our *Human Nature*. This *Light* is the same with the *Principle* of the *new Life*, which is that which is *naturally immortal*. So the *Evangelist's* former words imply: *In him was Life, and the Life was the Light of men*, v. 4. If therefore this *Light* was given to *all men*, the *mystical Life* must, at the same time, (by this *Reasoning*) be supposed to have been

been given them also. What then can hinder their being *actually Immortal*? Nothing indeed could do it, if the Gift here spoken of, as derived from the *Λόγος* to all men, had been the same with that *Divine Spirit*, which the *Scripture Reasoning* supposes as the *Principle of Immortality*, as the *Quakers* fanſie. But it is ſo certain, from the Current of the New Testament, that all Men have not that Spirit; that this is alone ſufficient to aſſure us that ſuch a ſenſe as that is, could not have been intended by the *Holy Ghoſt* in this place. *Moses*, wiſhing that God's People were all *Prophets*, plainly ſuppoſes that all God's People, even of that *Peculium*, had not the Spirit. Accordingly it is ſuppoſed, as the *Privilege* of the New *Peculium*, that they ſhould be all taught of God, in regard of this *Unction* of the Spirit, which was to teach them all things, this *Wiſdom*, which in all Ages entering into holy Souls, made them friends of God and *Prophets*, *Wiſd.* vii. 27. So the *Evangelist* tells us, That the Spirit was not yet given before our Lord was glorified. And the *Apoſtle*, that it was at his *Aſcenſion* that he gave gifts unto men, meaning theſe gifts of the Spirit: And that they had received it not by the Law, but by the Obedience of Faith. So the New Testament takes it for a *Prerogative* of our Saviour's Baptiſm to give the Spirit. At leaſt as to that general Union of our Lord's

*Disciples in the same Spirit, so as that who-
 ever had not the Spirit of Christ, should,
 for that very reason, be concluded to be
 none of his. And the pretended Gnosticks
 are said to be Psysical, not having the Spirit.
 And all that were out of the Orthodox Com-
 munion are therefore, through S. John's first
 Epistle, supposed to be in darkness, and li-
 able to all the dismal Consequences of being
 so. So far it is from being possible, by
 Scripture Principles, and his own Doctrine
 so clearly expressed elsewhere, that the same
 S. John could mean that every man, who
 comes into the World, should have this Light
 of the immortalizing Spirit. His meaning
 therefore cannot be of the $\omega\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$, but the
 $\omega\nu\omicron\eta\zeta\omega\eta\varsigma$, which was not taken for a Prin-
 ciple of actual Immortality, but only as a qua-
 lification for it, which might put Man in
 that middle station of indifferency between
 Mortality and Immortality, to be determin'd
 by the Event of his own Free-will. This is
 common to every man that cometh into the
 world. And therefore this it is, which our
 Apostle makes in all men, inlightned by the
 visitation of the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\text{Q}$, as an external Prin-
 ciple. Yet so as not to make any change
 in the Nature, in the Person so inlightned,
 without peculiar Divine Favour, and dispo-
 sitions in the recipient, for such a Union with
 the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\text{Q}$, as may qualifie it for the Divine
 Favour of raising it above its own Nature.*

Till

Till then, they are separable again, and this external Visitation of the Λόγος leaves the visited Ψυχή as Mortal as it found it, where there is no particular design of God for immortalizing it to Punishment. So the Apostle himself explains his own meaning: *The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not, v. 5.* And so Tatian Orat. cont. Græc. concerning this Human Soul: καὶ ἐαυτῇ σκότος ἔστι καὶ ἐδὲν ἐν αὐτῇ φωτεινόν, καὶ τῷτο ἔστιν ἄρα τὸ εἰρημνόν. ἡ σκότια τὸ φῶς οὐ καταλαμβάνει. The Soul still remains in Darkness as it was, where there is no κατάληψις, by which the Soul may lay hold on the Light, and unite it self with it, so as to receive the benefit of the Illumination, and to be actually illuminated by it. Till then, it cannot, by these Principles, have any Title to the regions of Light and Immortality. Tatian goes further for clearing the meaning of these Principles of the Evangelist. He denies this κατάληψις which must cause the Union to be in the power of the dark Soul, but makes it necessary that the πνεῦμα have a κατάληψις of the Soul, in order to the actual immortalizing it. So he goes on: ψυχὴ γὰρ ἐκ αὐτῆς τὸ πνεῦμα ἔσωσεν, ἐσώθη δὲ ὑπὸ αὐτῆς, καὶ τὸ φῶς τῷ σκότιαν κατέλαβεν, ὁ λόγος μὲν ἔστι τὸ τῷ δεῖν φῶς· σκότος δὲ ἡ ἀνεπιστήμην ψυχῆ. Διὰ τῷτο μόνη μὲν διαίτωμένη, πρὸς τῷ ὕλην νεύει καὶ τῷ συναποθνήσκουσα τῇ σαρκί· συζυγίαν δὲ κεκλήμενη τῷ τῷ θεῷ πνεύ-

πνεύματι. ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀλόγητον. ἀνέρχεται ὁ πρὸς
 ἀπερ' αὐτὸν ὁδὸν γὰρ χάρις τὸ πνεῦμα. No
 doubt he perfectly understood the impor-
 tance of these terms among the *Platonists*,
 from whom the *Evangelist* borrowed them:
 and therefore, in this matter, is a fair *In-*
terpreter of what the *Holy Ghost* was pleased,
 in using them, to confirm with his own *Di-*
vine Revelation. The rather, because the
Scripture it self agrees so exactly with him
 in the *Consequences* of what he delivers
 here. The *Scripture* also ascribes the ἐπι-
 ληψις to the Λόγῳ, not to the *Human*
Soul. That very word St. *Chrysostome* ren-
 ders by καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὴν, as being of the same sig-
 nification. The *Scripture* also owns the συ-
 ζυγία, the *Spiritual Marriage*, between
Christ and the *Soul*, as *Tatian* does also be-
 tween the *Soul* and the *Spirit*. *Christ* is
 the same way the *Head* of the *Man*, as the
Man is of the *Woman*. Here therefore is no
Mystical Marriage, no *Arrha* of the *Spirit*,
 which may entitle to the remainder at the
Resurrection. The *Ptolemaick Gnosticks* also
 in *Irenaeus*, have the same *Notions* of the
Invisibilty of their *Spiritual Seed* from their
fallen Aeon to those of the *Psychical Nature*,
 notwithstanding the glimpses externally
 given them. Yet they did not think such
 glimpses so received, sufficient to improve
 those *Psychical Beings*, to any excellency
 exceeding their own *Nature*. This Reasoning
 there.

Hebr. ii.
 16.

therefore is very agreeable to the *Platonick* terms, understood as the *Platonists* themselves, whose terms they were, did usually understand them. And that the Language of *S. John* in this beginning of his *Gospel* is *Platonical*; *S. Augustine* owns, not only from his *own* observation, but from the acknowledgment of the *Platonists* themselves. *Amelius* also a professed *Platonist* owns it, whose words we have preserved by *Eusebius*. Which being granted, it must be also agreeable to the sense of the *Holy Ghost* himself, as he has been pleas'd to express his *own sense* in these then known *technical* terms of the *Platonists*. This I have proved professedly in my *Prolegomena* to my honoured Tutor's Book *de Obstinatione*. Our modern *Enthusiasts* therefore are very much mistaken, when they hence prove all Men to have the *Spirit*, so as to be *actually illuminated* by him. No *union of Spirit and Soul* without a *κατάληψις*. No *κατάληψις* successful for *σωτηρία* from this *World*, but that whereby the *Spirit* lays hold on the *Soul*, which cannot be expected where the *darkened Soul* has no *κατάληψις* of its own. The want of this, leaves such a *Soul* in its former *darkness* and *disability* to mount into the regions of *Light* and *Immortality*. This *preventing κατάληψις* of the *Spirit*, without which that of the *Soul* is insignificant, may probably be the *preventing Grace* of the *Spirit*,

rit, asserted by the *Catholick Church*, in opposition to the *Pelagians*. And the denying it arbitrarily was *then* more *reconcilable* with the *Divine Goodness*, when the want of it did not expose the *Soul*, to which it was denied, to *Eternal Torments*; whilst *God* was pleased *not* to oblige them to lay hold on this preventing *Illumination* under any *penalty* for neglecting it, but only by the prospect of *promoting* their own greatest *Interest*.

34.
The dead
in Christ
who are to
rise first,
are not op-
posed to the
dead out
of Christ,
but to those
who con-
tinue not
in him till
their
death.

There are also other *Texts* which may be thought favourable to this *general* concern of all *Mankind* in the *Resurrection*. The *dead in Christ* are said to *rise first*, 1 *Thess.* iv. 16. But that does not necessarily imply that they shall rise at all who never heard of *Christ*. The *dead in Christ*, are they who are *actually* received into *Christ's Mystical Body*; and not only so, but who have *continued* in the *Mystical Body* to their *Lives end*, so as to *die* in it. For it is the *Resurrection to Happiness* that is here spoken of; not a *Resurrection simply*, as *indifferent* to *Happiness* or *Misery*. So it appears from that parallel *Text*; *Blessed are they who die in the Lord*, *Rev.* xiv. 13. The *dead in Christ*, are the same with those who *die in the Lord*. And the *Resurrection* spoken of, is only such a one as makes the *Persons* concerned in it *Blessed*. So it appears also in another place, where mention is made of this

this first Resurrection: Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first Resurrection: on such the second death shall have no power, Rev. xx. 6. And this is the Resurrection which is usually meant in the Sacred Writers, when the word is mentioned simply. The Resurrection to Misery, is thought as little to deserve the name of a new Life, as of a Resurrection. It is therefore called a second Death, when Life is restored for no other end but to qualify the Person for an Eternal Punishment, for which his own Nature had not qualified him. This Text therefore gives no account of them who are concerned in the Resurrection to Punishment: Those who had been formerly in Christ, though they did not die in him; and those who might have been in him, if themselves had pleased, though they never were in him actually. These are sufficient for the second Resurrection, though all out of the true Peculium, who had never heard of our Blessed Saviour, should never be concerned in it at all.

But the same Apostle tells us, that, As 35.
 many as have sinned without Law, shall also
 perish without Law: and as many as have sin-
 ned in the Law, shall be judged by the Law; They who knew of no Divine Law by which they were to be judged, are supposed by
 Rom. ii. 12. Here some Advantage may cer-
 tainly be taken from the Variation of the
 the Apostle to perish, rather than to be concerned in the Judgment rela-
 ting to the Breakers of the Law.

Phrase :

Phrase: that which is called *perishing* in the former part of the Verse, is opposed to being *judged* in the latter: And that the *perishing* here mentioned, may as well be understood of a *ceasing to be*, as of any *positive* Inflictions; and that it looks as if it were *designed* to intimate a *Diversity* in the two Cases, that the *Phrase* is so industriously altered. The Words may indeed bear that Design, yet there may be another Reason of the Change. *Judgment*, properly so called, seems to relate to a Tryal by a *Law*, and it was taken for one of the Privileges of the *Jews*, that God had given them a *fiery Law*, Deut. xxxiii. 2. wherein the Heathens could not rival them. Yet even the *Sins* of the *Gentiles* must suppose a *Law* violated by them, as every Sin is ἀνομία, though that *Law* was not promulged out of the midst of the *Fire*, like that of *Moses*. The same *Law* reached the *Gentiles* also so far, as the Parity of *Reason* reached the Case of the *Gentiles*. And the *Promulgation* was sufficient, where the *Equity* of the *Law* was *acknowledg'd* even by *them*. In this case, the Apostle's Reasoning holds, that *having not the Law* [that is, of the *Jews*] *they are a Law unto themselves*, v. 14. So that, in this Regard also, God's Punishment of the *Heathens* may also be called a *Judgment*. And that it was so intended, seems very probable from

from v. 5. where the Judgment of the Jews is said to be *in the Day of Wrath, and Revelation of the righteous Judgment of God, v. 5.* That Day is the Day of Judgment, as appears from v. 16. *in the Day when God shall judge the Secrets of Men by Jesus Christ, according to my Gospel.* These Words are separated from the Words objected only by a Parenthesis, and are therefore committed immediately with the Case of the Jews. If therefore the time when the Gentiles, who have *sinned without the Law*, shall *perish without the Law*, be the same with that wherein the Jews are to be *judged by the Law*; both Procedures must be referred to the Day of the general Judgment. And, though the Word *perish* may bear that milder Sense of only *ceasing to be*, yet it is also used, in the Scriptures, concerning them whom all must believe liable to the severest positive Inflictions. Judas himself is called *ὁὖς ἀπώλειας*, S. Joh. xvii. 12. Yet of this Case our Saviour himself assures us, that it had been good for him *if he had not been born*, S. Matth. xxv. 24. S. Mar. xiv. 21. which could not have been true, if his Punishment had been no more than a discontinuance of that being received at his Birth. So concerning the Vengeance inflicted on them who *obey not the Gospel: who shall be punished with everlasting Destruction from the Presence of the Lord, and*
from

from the Glory of his Power, 2 Theff. i. 9. ὁ λεθρον αἰώνιον is the Word. So concerning those who *denied the Lord that bought them*, ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς τυχὴν ἀπώλειαν. 2 S. Pet. ii. 1. The *Word* therefore will indeed bear a *larger* Signification. Yet, in *this* place, *Annihilation* may, perhaps, be more *natural*. So it will be best *opposed* to the case of being *judged*, as the *Jews* must be. And so it will best answer their State of being ἀνομῶν, *without Law*, as the same Apostle himself expresses it. Their being a *Law* to *themselves*, as *owning* the *Reasonableness* of the *things* impos'd as a *Law* by God on the *Jews*, but not on *themselves*, would no farther oblige *them* to the *Observation* of them, than as their *own Interests* might *prevail* with them to observe them, as they would avoid the *Punishments*, and obtain the *Rewards* of Providence in this *Life*; and as they would avoid the ill *Consequences* of *not* observing them, and enjoy those *Benefits* which were *naturally consequent* to their *Observation*. But this would not make them liable to the *Judgment*, as it was to award *Rewards* and *Punishments* for the *future*. That any such *future Rewards* or *Punishments* were to be, was a *new Revelation* of the *Gospel*, and particularly of the *Gospel preach'd* by S. Paul himself, v. 16. as I have now observed from *Acts* xvii. 31. But there are

two Uses of that Day: the former, not properly *Judicial*, but to give an account of the *Justice* of *Providence* in all its past Dispensations, by bringing every secret thing to light. That Use of a general Appearance, is intimated in the *Revelations* of the *Old Testament*, *Eccl. xii. 14.* For discovering the secret *Vertues* that had been rewarded in the *Prosperity* of *Sinners*, and the unknown *Wickednesses* which had been punished by the perpetual *Infelicities* of better-deserving Persons, and the many unknown ways of God for adjusting those seeming Incongruities to the Persons respectively concerned in them. This part of the Procedure of that Day, required the presence of all, as well as of the *Peculium*. Nor is there any Intimation, that even *Mortal Souls* might not survive the *Body*. The *Vehicle* on which they depend, as it was more subtil than their grosser organized *Bodies*, so they were thought to continue long after the *Dissolution* of their *Bodies*, and to continue the Existence of the *Souls* that depend on them. These *Vehicles* are the *umbra*, the εἰδωλα τανόντων, owned generally by the *Antients* from a consentient *Tradition* of which no Original is known, and therefore very probably from those *Divine Revelations*, which all Accounts of the earliest Nations believe familiar in the first Ages of Mankind. No other Original

is so *likely* of such *Traditions* wherein *Nations* were agreed *before* that mutual *Commerce*, and the Art of *Letters* by which they might *communicate* their *Inventions* to each *other*. However there can be little doubt but that the *Primitive Christians* were agreed in it. They believed *separate Souls* to have *visible Bodies*, of the same *Shape* with those wherein themselves lived formerly. Yet they believed *those Bodies* also *Mortal*, as being capable of *sensible Pain* by the *Corporeal Fire* of *Hell*. All *Passibility* was by them believed to be a *Tendency* to *Dissolution*, as I have already intimated. As therefore these *separate Souls* were capable of *sensible Pain* in the *Interval* between their *first Death* and the *final Judgment*, so they might be *dissolved* by that *more exquisite Fire*, which was to prevail in the last *Conflagration*. At least, so far as to deprive them of any *sensibility* of *Pain*, which they ascribed to a *separation* of their *Parts*. And without *Sense* we can hardly frame any *Idea* of a *Rational Soul*: None certainly that can be capable of *Punishment*. That therefore the *Souls* of *wicked Christians* shall be *enabled* to endure *Eternal Burnings* without *Dissolution*, is, by these Principles, to be ascribed to the same *Almighty Power*, by which the three *Children* were preserved in the *Fiery Furnace*. Only what was then performed
in

in Mercy, will here be ascribed to a Design of inflicting a more *exquisite Punishment*. Yet the *grossness* even of these *separate Vehicles* (if we may call them so) was the Reason why even *Souls*, designed for *Happiness*, were thought *disabled* to ascend to *Heaven* till the *Day of Judgment*; and in the mean time were thought to need the *Prayers* of their *living Brethren* on *Earth*, whilst they continued in those *separate Receptacles*, whither *Evil Spirits* were permitted to have Access.

As therefore even these *actually-mortal* 36. Souls were generally thought to *survive* these *grosser Bodies*, so there is Reason to believe that they may reach the general *Conflagration*. And indeed the *New Testament Revelations* seem generally to suppose that they shall indeed reach it. How else could the Men of *Nineveh*, or the Queen of *Sheba*, rise up in *Judgment* with the Generation which heard our Saviour's *Preaching*, and *condemned it*; if they were not, at least, to appear before that same Tribunal to which the *Despisers* of our Saviour's *Preaching* were responsible? How could our Lord pronounce the Cases of *Tyre* and *Sidon*, mentioned in the *Old Testament*, and those of *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*, as more *tolerable in the day of Judgment*, than those of *Chorazin* and *Bethsaida*, and *Capernaum*, where he *preach'd* and wrought his *Miracles*,
 Yet they might probably perceive in their Being till the day of the general Judgment. The Punishment of the Sodomites not in Hell. Fire.

cles, if those Heathens were not to appear at the day of Judgment? Nor is it easily intelligible, how the Case of those Heathens before the Gospel could be more tolerable at the day of Judgment, than the Case of those who had the Honour to hear our Saviour's Preaching, and to see his Miracles; if, besides the Vengeance, for which they were so famed in the History and Prophecies of the Old Testament, they had a new Arrear of Punishment to commence at the day of Judgment, that was to be Eternal, and suitable to the monstrous Nature of the Crimes for which they were to be inflicted. But the Case will be very easie, if their appearing at the day of Judgment, be with no Design of concerning them in the Judgment of the Day, but only in the Retrospective part of the day, for vindicating the Divine Providence, in Relation to what had been transacted by it formerly. In this Regard, that most formidable Example of Divine Vengeance on the Sodomites, by Fire from Heaven, was not to be compared with the Punishment of the meanest Criminals under the Evangelical Dispensation, on account of this single Consideration alone, that the Fire of the Sodomites had an end, and proceeded no farther than that Generation; but the Fire prepared for Evangelical Criminals, is Eternal, and exercised on Subjects extraordinarily enabled to suffer it eternally.

But

But I know the excellent Dr. *Hammond* conceives the *Sodomites* themselves to be in *Hell*, and proves his Opinion from the Words of St. *Jude*, v. 7. where he affirms them to suffer the *Vengeance of Eternal-Fire*. This he gathers, because the Participle ὑπέχουσα, is in the *Present Tense*, which that great Person understands so, as if the *Sodomites* were *then* in *Hell* when St. *Jude* wrote that Epistle, and as if St. *Jude* reasoned from that *Supposition*, that they were so. But had he reason'd so, he could not have reason'd from any *Authority* of the *Old Testament*. That had mentioned nothing concerning them, but what was *past*; no *Fire* in relation to *them*, but that wherein they and the *Cities about them*, as well as the *Inhabitants*, had *perished*; no *Hell* revealed *there*, wherein any but *Devils* were concerned; no Revelation then that any *Men* should be concerned in *that Hell*, which was originally prepared *only* for the *Devil* and his *Angels*; nothing concerning the *Eternal Punishment* of them who were *there*; nothing particularly of the *Sodomites* being there, or *continuing* there to the Times of the *Apostles*. How then could St. *Jude* gather any such Doctrine from the *Revelations* of the *Old Testament*? or *reason* from it, as he does here, against them who were to be concluded by those *elder Authorities*? The *Stile* indeed of the

Old Testament Prophecies, is full of Allusions to the *Judgments* of the *last Day*, even when it foretels *Judgments* confessedly *Temporal*, and which were fulfilled long before the *Apostles Age*. The reviving of the *dry Bones* in *Ezekiel*, was performed in the *Return* of the *Jews* from their *Captivity*. The *Day of the Lord* in *Joel*, is by *S. Peter* interpreted of that very time when he *Preached*, though described with all those formidable *Circumstances* which cannot be *litterally* applied to any but the *last* and *general Judgment*. And it is plain, that those *Dramatical Hyperbolical Expressions* in the *Prophecies* of the *Old Testament*, were not understood of any such *general Judgment* by the *Jews* of the *Apostles Age*. Had they been so, there had been no need of a *new Revelation* to the *Apostles* for this same Purpose, for satisfying their *Contemporaries* of the *Truth* of it. *S. Jude* therefore must have argued from his *own Authority*, and that of his *Fellow Apostles*, if this had been his Meaning. Why then did he not add, *according to my Gospel*, as *St. Paul* does in the same Case, *Rom. ii. 16.* where he insists on this *Revelation* of the *New Testament*, concerning the *Day of Judgment*? But to what Purpose had he done so against these *Despirers of Dominions*, and *Blasphemers of Dignities*; these *Separaters of themselves* as more excellent than any other
then

then in being, not excepting the *Apostles* themselves? That is the Notion of ἀποδιο-
 exCortes εἰσὺν, v. 19. as the *Pharisees* did,
 who had that *Name* given to their Sect,
 because they were also of the same Humour.
 But there is no need, that I can see, why
 we should have Recourse to that more vio-
 lent Interpretation. The αἰώνιον πῦρ, is
 very naturally applicable by the Reasonings
 of that Age, to the Fire from Heaven, by
 which the Cities of Sodom and Gomorrah
 were burnt, according to the Sacred Histo-
 ry. So the Writers of the New Testament
 and the Platonists reckon all the Invisible
 Heavenly Archetypes, 2 Cor. iv. 18. the
 things which are not seen, are eternal. So
 our Mansions in Heaven are called Eter-
 nal Tabernacles, in Allusion to the σκηνὰν
 of the Israelites, in their Pilgrimage from
 Egypt to Canaan, St. Luke xvi. 9. So the
 Manna, the true Bread from Heaven, is that
 which gives Life to the World, S. John vi
 32, 33. which was no otherwise true of the
 Manna in the Wilderness, than as its de-
 scending from Heaven, qualified it to be a
 Type of the Heavenly Manna. Accordingly
 the Life given by that Manna to the Israe-
 lites, who were fed by it, could be no o-
 ther but a Heavenly Life in Reversion, to
 such as were qualified for it, because that
 Generation, who were Partakers of it, did
 notwithstanding generally perish in the

Wilderness. And therefore, on the same account, the *Fire of Sodom*, as descending from *Heaven*, might, by the same *Mystical Reasoning*, be stiled *Heavenly*, and therefore *Eternal*. Not only so: That same *Fire* might be a further *Type* of the *Fire of Hell*, in which all should be concerned, who should be guilty of the *like* Impieties, under the Dispensation of the *Gospel*. And that on that general Account, that *all things*, which beset those who lived in those earlier Ages, beset them as *typical Examples* to those upon whom the *Ends of the World* were to come, 1 Cor. x. 11. And this I take to be the true Design of S. Jude: That the *Fire from Heaven*, by which the *Sodomites* were punished, was a *predictive Symbol* of the *like Fire* reserved for the *Gnostick Hæreticks* he speaks of, as guilty of the *like Immoralities*, under the Dispensation of the *Gospel*. And so were many other like *Examples* of those *first Ages*, which were confessedly *Temporal*, for that is a *general Rule*, in these *Reasonings*; that what was *Temporal* in the former *Legal Dispensation*, which was it *self* no more than *Temporal*, did *signifie* and *predict* something *answerable* to it, under the Dispensation of the *everlasting Gospel*; but *differing* from it in that *Particular*, that the *thing signified* was, according to the *Nature* of the *Dispensation*, under which it was to take place, it *self*, *eternal*.

nal also. So the *Fire* from *Heaven*, which destroyed the *Sodomites*, though it *self* was *extinguished* with its *Fuel*; yet signified a *Fire* that should *never* be *extinguish'd*, that should punish the *Rebels* against the *Eternal* Dispensation. And that *extraordinary* Contrivance of *God* in sending it from *Heaven*, when he could, if he had pleased, have made use of *Fires* occasioned by *Humane Neglects* for the same Purpose: That, I say, imply'd, in *this* way of *Reasoning*, that it should have *another Fire* answering it, under the more *noble* Dispensation, that should be, *like* the *Dispensation* it self, *Eternal*; because a *Fire* from *Heaven* was like to be so interpreted. This Analogy holds the more exactly, because the *Fire* of *Hell* it self, which the *new Revelation* owns as *Eternal*, is also described as being of the same *Cælestial* Original; not as breaking out from the *Centre* of the *Earth* it self, and its *subterraneous Volcanoes*, as *Philosophers* have fancied. So, *The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven, with his mighty Angels, in flaming Fire, taking Vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ,* 2 *Thess* i 7, 8. Therefore *God* himself is so often called a *consuming Fire*, *Deut.* iv. 24. ix. 3. *Hebr.* xii. 29. in regard of the *Schechinah*, which has the Nature of *Fire*, as well as of *Light*. So he is described:

A Fire shall devour before him, Ps. l. 3. This is that which so affrighten'd the *Jews* in the Delivery of the *Law*, and which makes it so *impossible* to see his *Face* and *live*. And seems to be alluded to by the *Poets*, when *Semele* is said to have been burnt by *Jupiter*, appearing to her in his *native* Glory. Therefore his *Angels* the *Satellites* of his *appearing* Presence, are said also to be a *flaming Fire*, *Ebr. i. 7.* from *Pf. civ. 4.* This *Fire* therefore of the *Magestical Presence*, is by all represented as *Eternal*; and as the *Original* of that which shall *destroy* the *World*, and *continue* the *Punishment* of those who are *adjudged* to it, to all *Eternity*. And because the *Fire* which destroyed *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*, is said to have *come down from Heaven*, their *Punishment* might very well be ascribed to this *Eternal Fire*. Yet it does not follow that, because the *Fire*, by which they were punished, was *Eternal*, therefore this *Punishment* must have been *Eternal* also. Rather, on the contrary, the *Eternals* of the *Gospel* being generally typified by *Temporal Symbols*; it will be more agreeable, that the *Fire* of *Sodom*, as a *Type* of *Hell*, should have been *Temporal* also. And so that *Fire* was indeed *Temporal*, as to the *Execution* inflicted by it on those two wicked *Cities*, which seems indeed *only* alluded to by *S. Jude* in his *Epistle*.

That

That will indeed appear to be the most probable way of understanding him, if we compare him with the parallel place of S. Peter. There the *Punishment* is said to be the *turning the Cities into Ashes*, 2 S. Pet. ii. 6. And consequently *no* other *Punishment* of the *Citizens* than what was necessarily consequent to the *destruction* of their *Cities*, which had an *end* with the *Cities* themselves, and therefore could not reach the *Age* of the *Apostles*. It is added further: That they were made *an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly*. This also shews that the *Punishment* here spoken of, could not be meant of the *Apostles* Age. The Persons, to whom S. Jude applies his discourse, were his then contemporary *Gnosticks*. The *Apostle* therefore, and his *Contemporaries*, must live *after* this *Punishment*, which was design'd as an *example* for *them*. Nor could that *Punishment* have been *exemplary*, if it had not been *before* them for whose *Terror* it was designed. No, nor unless it had been publickly *notified* before the *Time* of those who were in *danger* of following so pernicious an *Example*, and who were therefore to be *deterred* from following it by the *exemplary Punishment* of those who had *shewn* them so dangerous an *Example*. But how can we imagine this *notification* made, but by the *Scriptures of the Old Testament*, which mention both the

37.
Nor could
it be Hell
Fire which
S. Jude (in
the Case of
the Sodo-
mites)
calls eter-
nal Fire.

Sin

Sin of the Sodomites, and their Punishment too: but have not one word of any further Punishment they were afterwards to suffer in the days of the Apostles? What was then could not be known but by a new Divine Revelation, which could have no influence on the Senses of the Persons then living, but only on their Faith; and therefore could be no great Terror to those whom the Apostle himself supposes unfaithful. But the Belief of the Old Testament was already received and settled, even in these Infidels themselves, and confirmed by an Education in favour of it. This therefore he might securely Reason from, even against them, notwithstanding their Infidelity. And it is accordingly the custom of the Writers of the New Testament, as they suppose the Old Testament in general to be designed by Providence, for the instruction and warning of their own Age; so to ground the Notification of those Old Testament Examples on their being written, and the warning given by them on their being written long before the Persons who were to be instructed and warned by them: not on any New Revelation made to themselves, not discoverable in the Letter of the Old Testament it self. No not when they have to do with Persons better affected to their Authority than the Gnosticks concerned in this Epistle. So, Whatsoever things were written aforetime,

were

were written for our learning, Rom. 15. 4. *Περγεῖσθαι* is the word in both places. So that all the use of such Scriptures is derived from their being written, and written before the Case that made the Instruction necessary. So again: All these things hapned unto them for ensamples: and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come, 1 Cor. x. 6, 11. So in this very Epistle of S. Jude, the Gnosticks are said to be *περσελευσμένοι εἰς τὸ τοῦ κείνου*, and that *πάσαι*, v. 4. In regard of the many antient *γραφαι* mentioning the judgments of God inflicted on the like Offenders then referred to the Case of the Gnosticks by the Catholicks. And even here concerning the Case of the Sodomites themselves: *προκαίνται δὲ γὰρ*, v. 7. Plainly referring to their being mentioned in the Text of the Old Testament, with this design of warning the Gnosticks of the Apostolical Age, not to follow their example, and of letting them see what they must expect, in case they did follow it. That is the notion of *κεῖναι* with *κατέκειτο* in *Athenæus*, that a word had been mentioned in some antient Writer. And accordingly *προκαίναι* implies its being mentioned in the Scriptures, before the Case of the Gnosticks, who were to be instructed by it. Exactly answering the Sodomites being made an *ὑπόδειγμα* in S. Peter. The only Argument pretended by that excel-

cellent Person, why S. Jude should mean a Punishment endured by the Sodomites when himself wrote, is, that the *Participle* by which it is expressed, is in the *present tense*: *πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκης ὑπέχεται*. But if he had more narrowly examin'd the place, he would have found those words to be the *Nominative Case* to the *Verb* *περὶκαίτω*. That Observation would have let him see, That the *present tense* implied in the *Participle* did not relate to the *Age* of the *Apostles*, but that rather wherein the *Cities* of *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah* were destroyed by *Fire* from *Heaven*. That *Age*, I mean, mentioned by the *Scripture*, wherein they did *περὶκαίτω*, which that very word implies to have been *ancienter* than the *Age* of the *Apostles*. *Περὶκαίται ὑπέχεται* is indeed the same as *καίται περὶυπέχεται*, the *Preposition* being equally referred to either: That they were formerly mentioned in the *Scriptures*, as suffering the *Vengeance* of that *Eternal Fire* from *Heaven*; or that they had been mentioned in the same *Scriptures*, as having formerly suffered that same *Vengeance*. This will perfectly overthrow the *Inference* of that great and good Man. Yet *Philo*, an Author of the *Apostles* Age, makes even that *corporal sensible Fire* which destroyed the *Sodomites*, not yet extinguished in the *time* wherein he wrote. His words are; *μέχρι νῦν ὑγίεται τὸ γὰρ κατέσθιον πῦρ ἡμῶν*

σβέν-

σβέννυται μόνον ἢ νέμεται, ἢ ἐντύφεται. Πίσις δὲ σαφὲς αὐτῇ τὰ ὁρώμενα τῷ γὰρ συμβεβηκότες πόλεις σημεῖον ἔσιν, ὅ, τε ἀναδιδόμεναι. Αἰεὶ καπνὸς, καὶ ὁ μεταλλόμενος δέιον. And he immediately 'ubjoyns a δειγμα (that is S. Jude's word) of the prosperity of those Cities in the City that escap'd by the intercession of Lot. So he, *de Abrahamo*, p. 370. A. Again, *L. 2. de vitâ Mos.* καὶ μετὰ τῶν νῦν μνημεῖα τῶν συμβεβηκότες ἀλέκτες πόλεις δεικνύται κατὰ Σουλῶν ἐρεπία καὶ πέρεα, καὶ δέιον καὶ καπνὸς, καὶ ἡ ἐπὶ ἀναδιδόμενη φλόξ αἰμαυρά, καὶ δαίπερ διασφυχόμενος πυρὸς. p. 662 A. Here is a sensible περὶ κείσεως which S. Jude might very probably allude to, of that very Fire which destroyed the City of Sodom, which is said to be *Eternal*, yet could be *Eternal* in no other Sense than as that which lasts as long as the World lasts, is said to be so. Like the *perennes fontes*, and the *Everlasting Mountains*. So Josephus also: ἔστι γὰρ ἐπὶ λείψανα δέις πυρὸς Bell. Jud. Λογ. Δ κατὰ κζ. div. Græc. However, that *Temporary Fire*, which destroyed the Cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, might so far be called *Eternal* as really typifying an *Eternal Fire* that was, in the later days, to destroy not themselves, but the *Gnosticks*. Yet I confess we have a like Reasoning in the *Hellenistical Book of Wisdom*, which makes the Egyptian darkness an image of that darkness which they should afterwards receive, not like

like the *Rebels* against the Dispensation of the Gospel, but the *Egyptians* themselves, *Wisd.* xvii. 21. Yet even that is very well accountable by our present *Hypothesis*. I see no reason why the *Sodomites* might not, as well as the *Egyptians*, endure the Sufferings of the *future infernal* State, during the time of their *Duration*. That is, from the time of their *Death* to the day of *Judgment*. But I know *no* Scriptures that can be produced to prove, either that they shall suffer the Pains of the *future* state in their *Bodies*; or that they shall suffer them, even in their *Souls* for ever.

38. Thus far therefore I have shewn, That the *Immortalizing Principle* neither *was*, nor *was believed* in the *earliest* and *purest* Ages, any Ingredient in the *nature* of the *Human Soul* as *such*, so as that all *Mankind* might, on this account, be qualified to claim it as part of their *dues*, as *Men*. Yet I deny not but that the *Human Soul*, as *πρὸν* or *flatus*, was thought to be from *God*. And as it was thought to be from *God*, it was *designed* by him to qualify all that had it for that *preternatural* State of *Immortality* and *Happiness*, for which he had honoured the whole *Kind* with so *noble* an Original. S. Paul quotes the saying of the Heathen Poet *Aratus* with approbation: *Τὸ γὰρ καὶ γένετο ἡμῶν*, *Act.* xvii. 28, 29. And he *Reasons* on it, as granting it *True*, concerning the *Athe-*
nians,

The π on which is in all Men, (though it be of a Divine Original, yet) does not make us actually Immortal, but only disposes us for a Union with the Spirit.

nians, to whom he was then *Preaching*, as well as concerning *himself*. For even the *Breath of Life* was inspired into *Adam* by *God* himself, *Gen. ii. 7*. And therefore communicated to all *Mankind*, so far, the honour of being descended from a *divine* Original. *Tertullian* himself grants it of the *Matrix Anima* of *Adam*, though he makes all the *Souls* of his *Descendants* the same way begotten by his *Soul*, as their *Bodies* are by his *Body*. And this *God* gave him with a design of making him *naturally* neither *Mortal* nor *Immortal*; but capable of either, by the determination of his own *Free-will*. If he purged himself from the Pollution of *carnal* desires, he was put in hopes of being *Immortal* by the accession of the *Spirit*. If not, he was left to his *natural* *Mortality*, as accordingly it proved in the event. This *God* designed for all his *Posterity* as well as *himself*, as designing to put all in the same advantages. And though his *Posterity* be not put in actual possession of the *Spirit* as he was, yet the *status* they still retain, and all the Pretensions that can give them of qualifying themselves for a *Union* with the *Spirit*, by the use of so much *Free-will* as can remain after the expulsion of the *Spirit* it self. But upon so much harder terms, than he, as it is harder to acquire the *Union* with the *Spirit*, than to keep it when they were possessed of it, antecedently to the use of their own *Free-will*.

M

This

This I take to be the sense of *Tatian* in the place before mentioned. So he goes on; Γέρονε μὲν ἐν συνδιαίῳ ἀρχῆθεν τὸ πνεῦμα τῇ ψυχῇ. That is, in the Person of *Adam*, Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ταύτην ἔπειθαι μὴ βυλομένην αὐτῷ κατὰλέλοιπεν. This *desertion* of the *Spirit*, seems to be alluded to in the words of *Genesis*; *My Spirit shall not always strive with Man*, *Gen. vi. 3.* at least, as to the *general desertion* of the *Spirit*. *Tatian* adds, Ἡ δὲ ὥσπερ ἑναυσμα τὴ δυνάμει αὐτῆς κεκτῆμένη, καὶ διὰ τὸ χωρισμὸν τὰ τέλεια καθορᾶν μὴ δυναμένη, ζητῶσα τὸ θεόν, κατὰ πλάνην πολλὰς δεῖς ἀνετύπωσε, τοῖς ἀνίστοφιστεύουσι δαίμοσι κατὰκηρυχθήσασα. This seems to be the *light shining in the darkness*: Yet so that the *darkness* could not lay hold on it. That *darkness* himself before interpreted to be ἀναπνεύμων ψυχή. Nor can that ἑναυσμα be the *Spirit* it self, which he immediately after denies to be in all men. His words are very express, Πνεῦμα δὲ τὸ θεὸς παρὰ πάντων ἐκ ἔστι. What therefore can it be, but an *external Irradiation* of the *Spirit*, which, being obeyed, will qualifie the well disposed *Souls* for a *Union* with the *Spirit* it self? So he; αἱ μὲν παιδόμεναι σοφία, σοφίῃσιν αὐταῖς ἐφείλητο πνεῦμα συγγενές. He owns therefore a *syngeneia* between the *νοῦς*, the *Soul* it self, and the *πνεῦμα*, because they were *originally* united by *God*, who intended they should still have continued so in all men, if

men

men had not been wanting to *themselves*. This I take to be the meaning of the *Apostle*, when he owns all *Human Souls*, as distinct from the *Spirit*, to be the *Off-spring* of God; Yet so as to allow none for *Sons*, but them who have the *Spirit* of *Adoption*, which is not otherwise to be expected *now*, but in our *Christian Baptism*. *Πνοή* is enough for the one, but *πνεῦμα* is requisite for the other. But the *former* alone cannot give any necessary *Right* to the *other*, but only a *Capacity*. As all *Free-born* Persons are *capable* of the *highest* Offices in a *Society*, which notwithstanding are not *many*, and therefore can be enjoyed *only* by a *few*.

But the way how the *former* may qualify for the *latter*, as it is little *observed* now, so it is necessary to be further *explained*. But from the *Notions* and *Reasonings* of the *first* and *purest* Ages. It is certain that as there was no claim from *Humane Nature* in general, that could entitle *all* men to this *Supernatural* Principle of the *Spirit*; so neither was there any *Promise*, or *Divine Revelation*, that God would be pleased to give that to *all* men, which none could challenge on any *other* Title. No *Covenant* after *Adam* with *Mankind* in general, that every *Individual* should have it restored to them, since they had *lost* their claim by the *Covenant* with *Adam*. No *Divine Covenant* with any *particular Nation*, but the *Old* *M 2* *Peculium*,

39.

No ordinary means
seised for
conveying
the Spirit
before the
Gospel.

Peculium, till the *New Covenant* by *Christ*. Nor any *Covenant*, even with the *Jews* themselves, expressly relating to their *Souls*, and the *Life to come*, so far from any express *Stipulation* for the *Spirit*. No *Sacramental Symbol* then for conveying it to any, as a *Principle* of a *New* or *Diviner Life*, which was the only consideration that could entitle the *Receiver* to *Immortality*. The *Spirit* that was then conveyed by the *Symbol* of *Unction*, was plainly of another kind, relating to *Gifts* rather than *Graces* of the *Spirit*; and *Gifts* of a lower kind, relating principally to *publick Offices* in this *Life*, and therefore principally for the good *Administration* of the *Visible Body* rather than the *Personal Benefit* of the *Receiver*. The conveying it by a *Covenanting Symbol* to be received by every particular *Member*, and as a *Principle* of *Divine Life*, is the peculiar *Prerogative* of the *Gospel*. And since this *Ordinary* way of conveying it is settled, and settled by a *Divine Establishment*, and that for ever; there is no reason why any now should expect it, who uses not the ordinary visible means appointed by *God*, for receiving it. No more than *Naaman* could pretend to a cure of his *Leprosie*, by any *Waters* besides those of *Jordan*, after *God* had been pleased to confine his own favour to that particular *River*. But before that *Confinement* of the *Gospel*, the limitation

of the *Old Peculium* seemed principally to relate to the Favours of *this Life*; as their *secular Government* was a *Theocracy*, and as they might hope to *over-rule* the Interests of *other Nations*, by having a more *potent Numen*, whenever their *Interests* should be *inconsistent*. Their Plea therefore to the *Spirit* on this account, was no other than as the *Spirit* was the *ordinary* Administrator under the *Supreme Being*. And no other could, on this account, lay any *claim* to the *Spirit*, than as they were concerned in the Administration of the *Civil Government*. So their *Princes* were; and their *Priests*, as they were principally privileged with the Oracle of *Urim*, and the Case of *Jealousie*, and the miraculous *Cures* of *Leprosie*, and the *Expiation* of *Piacular Sins*, which might bring *temporal* Judgments on the *whole Body*; and their *Prophets* also, as employed on *Divine Messages*, or consulted on their *Temporal* Affairs. All these, if they ever meddled with any thing relating to the *Future Life*: it was but *occasionally*, and beyond the *Expectation* of the Dispensation *then* obtaining. But these Claims were all grounded on the *Offices*, rather than the *Vertues*, of the *Persons* who *then* received the *Spirit*. And were only of *Gifts* more necessary for the *Publick*, than designed for the *Personal* benefit of those who *had* the *Gifts*. These therefore can

have nothing to do with the *Inhabitation* of the *Spirit*, as a *new Principle* of a *Diviner Immortal Life*, which was never intended to be *confined* to *Offices*, but was by *God* originally *designed* as a *Reward* of *Personal Vertue*, even in *Adam* himself, and therefore in all his descending *Posterity*. *Prophetick Instinct*, and *Divinatory Dreams*, and *Occasional Afflation*, were *sufficient* for *those* ends of *Government*, which required no *constant* *Inhabitation*, much less any *Animation*, of the *Diviner Spirit*. That therefore which might contribute to the receiving the *Spirit* thus understood, in order to the *advancing*, and *immortalizing*, the *Nature* of the *Person* who received it, must be something *common* to all the *Members* of that *Peculium*, and wherein none might be able to plead any *Prerogative* above his *Brethren*, but what might be imputable to his better *use* of those same *Expedients* which were *common* to their whole *Body*. That could be no other but the *common Discipline* of the *Dispensation* under which they lived. For there was *then* no *Revelation* concerning *God's design* of receiving all particular *Members* to that *highest* of all *Favours* of which their *Nature* was capable of receiving the *Spirit* as a *Principle* of a *new Life*, distinct from the *Covenant* made with *Adam*, who had *forfeited* it for *himself* and his *Posterity*. And it is certain,

tain, by the *Revelations* of the *New Testament*, That it was *not* thus *actually* given to any *then*. Because it was the *Office* of the same *Λόγος*, who was the *second Adam*, the *Man from Heaven*, who gave the *Spirit* to *Adam* himself, that he could alone renew the *Spirit* to his fallen *Posterity*. All therefore that could be done *then*, was to *qualify* themselves, as to those *dispositions* which were in their *Power*, for receiving the *Spirit*, when the appointed *season* should come for *giving* it. One *qualification* God had *given* them, without their own contribution; that is, That they were all born of the *Patriarchal Seed*, and descended from those *Ancestors* to whom God had made *Promises*, and entered into *Covenants* for *themselves* and their *Posterity*. And, though the *Spirit* was no *particular Article* of these *Covenants* on God's part; yet their being *chosen* for God's *particular Care* and *Patronage*, made them the most likely *Candidates* for *unknown arbitrary Favours*; even such *Favours* also, as had *not* been originally *designed* for all who participated in the same *common Human Nature*, as this was. But as they were of the *Patriarchal Seed*, they were *incorporated* into that *Body*, of which our *Lord* himself was the *Head*, and consequently were entitled to all the *Purchases* of his *Blood*, though themselves did not *then* know it. And among them the *Prin-*

cipal was the *Spirit*. But whether *Rebels* among them should be *immortalized* to *Punishment*, may not possibly seem altogether so clear. Yet there is *rather* reason to believe they *might*. Their *Theocratical* Government, even then, was believed to be under the administration of the *Λόγος* immediately, whose *Spirit* it was, that had so great a share in the *subordinate Administration* under him. As therefore his *Spirit* is said to have been *grieved* by those *Rebels*: so *Christ* is said to have been *tempted* by them. And he is said to have been *afflicted* in all their *Afflictions*, on account of his *Sympathy* resulting from his *Matrimonial Unity* with them. For the *Λόγος*, not the *Father*, was supposed to have the *Schechinah*, which made him capable of *conversing* with *Mankind*. Thus their *Rebellion* against the *Theocracy*, under which they lived then, may make them responsible to our *Blessed Lord*, as committed against his *Person*, and as properly reflecting on him, who is to be the *Judge*, and as he was the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, and the *Legislator* of the *Decalogue*, as well as their *other* written *Laws*. But this was common to them all, and only qualified them *conditionally*, if they observed the *Ceremonial Expiations* prescribed by the *Law* it self, which *God* was pleased to accept as *Expedients* for promoting that *Purity of Mind* which was *requisite* to *qualifie* them

them for a *Union* with his *own Divine Spirit*. This was in their *own* power, and on this depended the *Event*, as to *particular Persons*, as to the *entitling* them particularly to the *Rewards* or *Punishments* of the *Dispensation* respectively. Yet even this alone was *not* thought sufficient for attaining the *Spirit*. It was to be attained by the *Old Dispensation*, no otherwise, than as the observing it, entitled those who did so, to the *Benefits* of the *New*, among which this of the *Spirit* was the *Principal*.

This therefore being given only by the *new Dispensation*, could not be expected, by any who lived under the *old Dispensation*, on any other *Terms*, but those of the *new*. And the *general Condition*, required from *all* by that, is *Belief*. This our *Blessed Lord* declares, as the *Rule* of his *Procedure* in that *Judgment*, by which he intends to adjudge *Eternal Rewards* and *Eternal Punishments*, that *he that believes and is baptized, shall be saved; and that he who believes not, shall be damned*. The *Baptism* is that of the *Spirit*, which is that which must *immortalize*. And the *Just* himself cannot expect to *live*, that is, this *Immortal Life* by his *Justice*, that is, by his *real observing* of the *old Law*, but by his *Faith* prescribed by the *new*. But, as the *Apostle* reasons, *Faith comes by hearing*, *Rom. x. 16, 17*. which he gathered from *Is. iii. 1*.

40.
Faith *
(by the
Terms of
the Gos-
pel) requi-
site for re-
ceiving the
Immorta-
lizing Spi-
rit.

If. liii. 1. The Word, we there translate report, is in the Greek ἀγγή. Thence the ἀγγή πιστῶς, Gal. iii. 2, 5. That therefore the deceased Members of the old Peculium, might be qualified for the Benefits of the new, it was requisite they should believe the Gospel; and, in order thereunto, it was withal as requisite that they should hear it. This therefore was by the Antients believed to be the Cause of our Blessed Lord's Descent into Hell, as Hell is taken for the common Receptacle of Souls, both good and bad; that is, that he might there preach the Gospel to them, who never heard of it while they were on Earth, to qualifie them for their final Sentence by their Faith or Disbelief of it. The Testimonies of Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, are very plain and full to this Purpose, not now to mention the more numerous ones of lower Ages, which (I know) will be less regarded. The Foot-steps of this Opinion are so unanimous, and so near the Apostolical Original, and so agreeable to the Principles and Reasonings of the Apostolical Age, and so uncontradicted by any Monuments of those Times; that it is hard to conceive how they could have any other Original than Apostolical. I shall mention only some of the most antient.

Clem. Al.
Str. ii. 6
Strom. vi.
Origen
contr. Cels.
l. ii.

Such

Such is that *Eph. v. 14. Wherefore he* 41.
saith, awake thou that sleepest, and arise from Therefore
the Dead, and Christ shall give thee Light. the An-
 This is the same with the *Immortal Life,* tients
S. John i. 4. And it is an Address to the (even of
Dead, who are frequently said to *sleep,* in the Apo-
 the *Prophetical Style of the New Testament;* stolical
 and the *Light* seems to allude to the *Bap-* Age) be-
tismal Illumination of the Spirit, upon lieved,
 owning the true *Faith.* Such is that also that our
 of *S. Peter, 1 Eph. iii. 18, 19, 20. Christ* Saviour
hath also once suffered for Sin, the just for preached
the unjust (that he might bring us to God) to the se-
being put to Death in the Flesh, but quickned parate
by the Spirit: by which also he went and Souls of
preached unto the Spirits in Prison; which those who
sometimes were disobedient, when once the deceased
long suffering of God waited in the days of before his
Noah. The Spirit here cannot be the Spi- Incarna-
 rit of Christ in Noah or any other Patriarch
 then living, but the Spirit of Christ himself
 who is here said to have been the Preacher.
 That very Spirit wherein he lived at the
 same time wherein he was alive, at the same
 time that he was put to Death in the Flesh;
 that Spirit which is elsewhere opposed to his
 Flesh, *1 Tim. iii. 16.* That Spirit which is
 ascribed to him as the *second Adam,* and
 the Lord from Heaven, and which is called
 a *quickning Spirit,* *1 Cor. xv. 45.* as being
 it self *uncapable* of dying, and as being a
Principle of Life to all others that partake
 of

of it. Nothing could be more properly mentioned on this occasion, than that very *Spirit* in which he might be *present* with them, though *absent* in the *Flesh*, 1 Cor. v. 3 Col. ii. 5. Than that *Spirit*, which, upon their *Belief* of his *Preaching*, was to be given them also in its *First-fruits*, in its *earnest*, as a *pledge* of their *Immortality*, and a *Principle* by which it was to be conferred. Nor could this *Preaching* in his *Spirit* agree to any *time* so conveniently, as *that* where-with it is here *joyned*, when he was *put to Death in the Flesh*; that is, to the *space* between his *Death* and *Resurrection*. And the words, *sometime disobedient*, plainly imply, that their *Disobedience* was long *before* the *time* wherein they were *preached to*. And his *Preaching* is plainly *distinguished* from the *Preaching* of *Noah*, the *Preacher* of *Righteousness*, 2 S. Pet. ii. 5. That *time* of *Noah*, is said here to be the *time* of the *long suffering* of *God*, wherein 120 Years were allowed them for a *respite*, Gen. vi. 3. and is opposed to this *new Preaching* of *Christ*, wherein there was *no* such *respite* granted, no such *Argument* of *long-suffering*, but their final *Answer*, whether they would *believe*, was expected within the *space* between the *Death* of our *Lord* and his *Resurrection*. Here was the fittest *season* for visiting those *Patriarchs* in the same *Spirit*, which was to *restore* them that *Spirit*, as a *security* for their *Immortality*,

Immortality, which was *withdrawn* from them generally in those days of *Noah*, when *God* expressly warned them that his *Spirit* should *not always strive with men*. This seems to relate to the *Image of God* restored to *Seth* after the Fall of his *Father*, which was not taken away from their *Body* till this time. The Children of *Cain* had long before lost their *Title* to it, not only on account of *Adam*, but also of *Cain* himself, who never *had* the *Spirit* himself, that he might *derive* it to his *Posterity*. And the *Scripture* it self supposes this to have been the Case, when it calls the *Sons of Seth* only the *Sons of God*, and the *Daughters of Cain* the *Daughters of Men*, because it is this *Spirit of Adoption* which entitles us, even in the *new Peculium*, to the honourable style of being the *Sons of God*. So again the same *S. Peter*, iv. 6. *For this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to Men in the Flesh, but live according to God in the Spirit*. Here it is plain, that the *Spirits in Prison* are the departed *Souls* of them who were then *dead* when the *Gospel* was *preached* to them; and therefore that the *Preaching* cannot be understood of the *Preaching of Noah*, or of any other Person who *preached* to them while they were yet *alive*. It appears also that the *design* of this *Preaching* was, that they might *live*. A
Life

See Disc.
of Marri-
age, &c.

The Distinction between

Life undoubtedly that was no necessary consequent of their own *Nature*, and which they could not have had but by the benefit of this *Preaching*, and the *Flexibility* of their own *Wills*, by which they might be enabled to receive the *Benefit* of this *Preaching*. And this agrees with the words: *that they might be judged according to Men in the flesh*. The meaning could not be, that this *Preaching*, which was designed for *entitling* those dead Persons to *Life*, could give Men then *living* any *Reason* to judge those as still in the *Flesh*, who were punished in the *Deluge*. But rather that notwithstanding Men then *living* were possessed with *hard* thoughts of the *final* state of those who perished in the time of *Noah*; yet, by the *benefit* of this *Preaching*, many should be found entitled to this *Immortality*, which was the *Privilege* of the new *Peculium*. The Expression, though it may seem strange, is yet exactly parallel to that of *S. Paul*, *God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin; but ye have obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine which was delivered you, Rom. vi. 17.* That they had been the *servants* of *Sin*, could be no *Reason* of thanks to *God*, but rather that which followed in the *Apodosis*: that, though they had been formerly the *servants* of *sin*, they had now obeyed from the heart the form of the doctrine which was delivered to them. But this censorious Judgment of Men here, supposes

poses the *Preaching* to have been to them in their *separate state*, because the *good event* of it was *unknown*, and therefore could be no restraint to *censorious* Persons who knew *nothing* but the *hopeless* condition of their *entrance* on the state of *Separation*. A like passage is preserved by S. *Justin Martyr* and *Irenæus*, so antient *then* as to be ascribed to either *Jeremiah* or *Isaiah*. The words are these: Ἐμνήθη ὃ κώρυξεν ὁ θεός τῶν νεκρῶν ὡς τῶν κοιμημένων εἰς γλῶσσαν, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εὐαγγελισαῖν αὐτοὺς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτῶν. S. *Justin* charges the *Jews* with cutting these words out of the Prophecy of *Jeremiah*. So in the *Latin Book of Ecclesiasticus*: Penetrabo omnes interiores partes terræ, & inspiciam omnes dormientes, & illuminabo omnes sperantes in Domino, xxiv. 45. These are so early Authorities, and so esteemed by them who lived in the *next Age* to the *Apostles*, that it is hardly possible that they could be *inconsistent* with the *then* notorious *Traditions*. But, being plain *Consequences* from these *Principles* now proved *Catholick*, they can hardly be otherwise than *Catholick* themselves. Nor would it have been mention'd in so many *Creeds*, unless the *Churches* that so inserted them, had thought them of more *Consequence* and *Authority* than *private Opinions*. And the *literal Sense* of the *Descent into Hell*, is that which has always

S. Justin,
Dial. cum
Tryphon.
p. 298.

S. Iren. l.
iii. 23.

iv. 39, 45,
56, 66.

v. 26.

ways had the greatest Authority. As for our own Church, we still retain the Clause of the *Te Deum* that favours it: *When thou hadst overcome the Sharpness of Death, thou didst open the Kingdom of Heaven to all Believers.* It is plainly here said to be, when our Saviour *had overcome the Sharpness of Death*, which exactly agrees to the Space between his *Death* and *Resurrection*. Then it was, when he was in *Adns*, that he *opened the Kingdom of Heaven* to those who *believed*, in the place where *himself* was. That is, who *believed* in *Adns*. But they could not *believe* without a *Preacher*, *Rom. x. 14.* He must therefore preach in *Adns*. Here therefore the *Kingdom of Heaven* is *opened* to the *deceased* in *Adns*, on the terms now mentioned, of *Faith*. And in our first *Articles*, in *Edw. the Sixth's* time, our *Church* was exprefs for a *local Descent*, and quoted for it the forementioned Passage of *S. Peter*, in the *Article* it self. Though she has since been pleased to forbear the *imposing* it, in the later Edition under *Queen Elizabeth*.

42. Besides, by the Terms of the Gospel, *Baptism* is necessary, as well as *Faith*, for recovering our lost *Immortality*. Our Saviour's words are very exprefs: *He that*
 Water Baptism, also necessary (by the Gospel) for receiving the Spirit, which therefore the Antients believed to have been given to the separate Souls of them who had no means of attaining it when living.

believeth,

believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved, S. Mark xvi. 16. Faith alone therefore is not sufficient Security for this Salvation. So Baptism is said to save us, 1 S. Pet. iii. 21. And not only the Baptism of the Spirit, as the immediate Principle of Immortality, but the Baptism of Water also, as the only ordinary means appointed by Christ for obtaining the Spirit. In this also, our Saviour's words are very exprefs: *Verily, Verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, S. Joh. iii. 5. This therefore is another Reason of Preaching to such separate Souls as had not, before death, heard of our Blessed Lord and his Gospel, that they might not only be converted to a Belief of him, but be Baptized also. And that even with the Baptism of Water. So the Apostolical *Hermas*: * *Quare de profundo hi lapides ascenderunt, & positi sunt in structuram turris hujus; cum jampridem portaverint Spiritus justos? Necesse est, inquit, ut per aquam habeant ascendere, ut requiescant. Non poterant enim aliter in regnum Dei intrare quàm ut deponerent mortalitatem prioris vitæ. Illi igitur defuncti sigillo Filii Dei signati sunt, & intraverunt in regnum Dei. Antequam enim accipiat homo nomen Filii Dei, morti destinatus est; at ubi accipit illud sigillum, liberatur à morte, & traditur vitæ. Illud autem sigillum aqua est in quam descendunt ho-*

* L. iii.
Similitud.
ix. n. 16.

N

mines

A ne Distinction between

mines morti obligati, ascendunt verò vita assignati : & illis igitur pradicatum est illud sigillum ; & usi sunt eo, ut intrarent in regnum Dei. Et dixi : Quare ergò, Domine, illi quadraginta lapides ascenderunt cum illis de profundo jam habentes illud sigillum ? Et dixit : Quoniam hi Apostoli & Doctores, qui pradicaverunt nomen Filii Dei, cum, habentes fidem ejus & potestatem, defuncti essent, pradicaverunt his qui antè obierunt, & ipsi dederunt eis illud signum, κηρύγμα. [what follows, is from Clemens Alexandrinus] κατέβησαν ἐν μετ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πάλιν ἀνέβησαν. Ἀλλ' ἔτοι ζῶντες κατέβησαν, καὶ πάλιν ζῶντες ἀνέβησαν ἐκείνοι, οἱ προκεκοιμημένοι, νεκροὶ κατέβησαν, ζῶντες ἔτι ἀνέβησαν. Διὰ τῶτων ἐν ἐξωποιοῦντο, καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ Θεοῦ. Διὰ τέτο καὶ συνανέβησαν μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ συνήρμοσαν εἰς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ πύργου, καὶ ἀλατόμητοι συνωκοδομήθησαν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ἐκοιμέθησαν καὶ ἐν μεγάλῃ ἀγνείᾳ· μόνον ἔτι τὴν σφραγίδα ταύτην ἐκ ἔχον. We see here that neither the great Exactness in observing the Law prescribed them (that is their δικαιοσύνη) nor their Abstinence from Pollutions, Legal or Mystical, (that is their ἀγνεία) was thought sufficient to entitle those to this immortal Life, who died before our Saviour's Incarnation, without an explicit Faith in him, and Baptism, even that of Water also, in order to their further Purification, and to the entitling them to the Spirit.

Spirit. This, very probably, might be the Reason of the *Præctice* alluded to by the *Apostle*, of *Baptizing for the Dead*, 1 *Cor.* xv. 29. It might have been, on these *Principles*, for *known Believers* who had *qualified* themselves for all the Favours of the *Gospel*, by *living* suitably to the *Faith* professed by them, but had, by some Providence, unavoidable by *Human Diligence*, been taken away *before* they had received the Sacrament of *Baptism*, and might therefore be believed to have a very just *Title* to the *Equity* of the *Baptismal Covenant*, though they had none by the *Letter* of it. In this Case they might hope to *entitle* such rightly dispos'd Persons (who wanted nothing requisite on their own parts, that *was*, or ever *had been*, in their own power) by putting them into *possession* of it, as far as they were able *then*, in the Persons of their *Susceptors*, or *Stipulators*, which the *Law* allowed in many Cases, where the Duty to be performed was not perfectly *inseparable* from the *Person*. This might especially be presumed, when the *deceased* Person had received the *Spirit* immediately on his *Conversion*, and before his *Baptism*, and had withal *external Evidences* of his having *received* it, in visible *Schechinahs*, and the gift of *Tongues*, and such other proofs as might satisfy, even *Unbelievers*, as they did *Simon Magus*, even when he was in the

gall of bitterness. This was not unfrequent *then*, I am apt to think it was *usual* in the *first* Conversions of a *Province*, and especially in the Case of the *first Converts* in it. And the *Reasoning* of the *Apostle* from it, seems to suppose it in this very place of the *Epistle* to the *Corinthians*. He speaks of such a Baptism as could have no effect but upon the *Body*, and which therefore could have no effect, if the *Body* of him who had been *initiated* by it, should not *rise*; that is, of such a *Baptism* which could have no other effect, but that of making them *one Body* with *Christ*. Such that *Baptism* must be, which was administered to them who were already one Spirit with *Christ*, by their having *actually* received his Spirit. To such there remained no *other Union* that could be ascribed to their latter Baptism, but the *Bodily one*, by their being Baptized into the *one Body of Christ*, which is true only of the *Water Baptism*, in contradistinction to the Baptism of the Spirit. And indeed his whole Reasoning proceeds only on that *Baptism* which made them *one Body* with *Christ*. The *Consequences* will not hold otherwise, that if *Christ's Body* was raised, theirs must be raised also: Nor, on the contrary, That if their Bodies should not rise, they could not *truly* own the raising of the Body of *Christ*. Both Arguments suppose them *one Body* with *Christ*; that is, in a *Mystical Sense*,

Mem-

Members of his Body, of his *Flesh*, and of his *Bones*, as the same Apostle does elsewhere express it. And this seems to have been the Reasoning of those *Hereticks*, against whom the Apostle here disputes. They pretended the *Resurrection* was past already, 2. *Tim.* ii. 18. Their meaning seems to have been, not, as it would now be popularly understood, as if a bare *change* of *Manners*, a *rising* from *sin* to *newness* of *Life*, had been all the *Resurrection* that was promised by the *Christian Religion*: But that the *Resurrection* was the *winging* of the *Soul*, by which it was enabled, when it pleased, to mount again to *Heaven*, where it was supposed to have been *originally* before its *fall* into the *Body*. For this *Wing* the Christians called the *Spirit*, which was given in the *Baptism* of the *Spirit*. This was pure *Platonism*, and generally the sense of those *Philosophers* who were for *Religion*, and agreed with them in particulars of this kind. But then these *Philosophers* were not concerned what became of the *Body*, because they thought it *pænal* and *præternatural* to the *Soul*. They would therefore have taken the *immortalizing* the *Body* for a design of *perpetuating* its *Exile* and *Punishment*, rather than of reducing it to its *primitive* and most *perfect* State. This made the *Christian Doctrine* of the *Resurrection* of the *Body* so unacceptable to the *learned* of those

Ages, and the contrary Doctrine so *pleasing* to the *Hereticks*, who were more influenced by the *Authority* of the *Philosophers* than of our Blessed *Saviour* and his *Apostles*. And the *ground* of that Opinion was, that those *Philosophers* believed the *Soul* naturally *Immortal*. Thence it was obvious for them to infer, that such *Bodies* as ours are, that are fitted with *Organs* proper for restoring the *decays* of the *Individuals*, and for *perpetuating* the *Species* by the production of new *Individuals*, could not be *natural* to it, because both those kinds of *Organs* suppose the *Mortality* of the *Individuals*. For confuting therefore of this received Opinion, it was very proper to shew that *Christ* had raised his *own Body*, and therefore did not believe it *præternatural*, or *inconsistent* with the perfect *Happiness* of his *exalted* State. This he proves by that *Topick* (which, in that *near Memory* of the *Fact*, was most proper for a Subject of that Nature) of the *Testimony* of those who had *seen* him after his *Resurrection*, most of whom were still *living*, and might yet be consulted by them who doubted of it. This therefore being granted, he proves further, that the *Christian Sacraments* were designed to make us *one Body* with him, as well as *one Spirit*. Thence it followed, that if his *glorified* State required a *Body*, ours must do so too: And therefore that the *contrary* Doctrine ruined the

the *credit* of all those initiatory Rites by which they had been made *Christians*, which were purposely designed to *assure them*, that their *Bodies* should share in their *immortal* Happiness, and therefore must *themselves* be made *immortal* also, v. 14, 15. Accordingly he shews in 2 *Tim.* ii. 18. that it had this effect on some, that it made them *abandon* the profession of *Christianity* it self, as rendring all their pretensions to *Divine Revelation* suspicious to those who more firmly believed the *inconsistency* of the *Corporeal* State with *Cælestial* Happiness, than the *Testimony* of those upon whose *Credit* they had received their *Christianity* it self. This I take to be the importance of those words, *and overthrow the Faith of some*. For had it been only a denial by *Consequence* of what they *owned* by their *Communion*; it must have overthrown the *Faith*, not of *some* only, but of *all* who *believed* that *Doctrine*. But to those who were *more* perswaded of the *Truth* of *Christianity* than of *that Doctrine*, it was very proper for the *Apostle* to urge this avowed *Practice* of the Church. And the rather, because he seems to suppose it so *generally* receiv'd, as that some of his *Adversaries* had been *concerned* in it, not considering how inconsistent it was with their new *Heresie*, I mean that of *Baptizing* those with a design of thereby *securing* them from *Death*, who could not (by their own

Principles) be in danger of any other *Death* besides that of the *Body*, as being already secure of the *Spirit*. This was certainly the case of *Cornelius*, who was *baptized* with *Water*, notwithstanding he had already receiv'd the *Spirit*. It is not therefore a *Personal mistake* on which he reasons in this Case, as is commonly conceived. This *Apostolick* Author shews that this *Baptism* of *Water*, was thought as necessary to secure from *Death*, as that of the *Spirit*. Hence therefore we understand, how *necessary* it was (by the *Principles* even of that *purest* Age) that the *separate* Souls of their Predecessors should have *Baptism* of *Water* as well as Faith, for securing them of the *Resurrection* of their *Bodies*. I know it will be thought strange, how *separate* Souls could receive *Corporeal Baptism*. And very probably it would have been thought as strange *then* as *now*, if the Doctrine had been the same *then* as *now*, concerning the *pure spiritual Nature* of the *separate Soul*. But as they *then* thought the *Souls* incapable of receiving any impression from *Fire* without some degree of *Corporeity*; so the same *Body* that qualified them for *Fire* might make them capable of *Lustrations* by *Water* also. Indeed *Lustrations* by *Fire* and *Water* were usual in their *Mysteries*, and were thought beneficial by *Plato* for clearing themselves from the *βόβοει*, the *corporea pestes*,

pestes,
their
cular
Febru
ary, v
that S
mate
also.
stians
their
given
tion c
prete
T
site t
bene
and
and
been
they
sins
upo
by
part
this
Men
was
fessi
fore
My
is t
to b

pestes, as *Virgil* calls them, that hindered their ascent to Heaven. And *Water* particularly was made use of in their annual *Februa* to the *Dii manes* on the first of *February*, which Month receives its Name from that Solemnity, which *Tertullian* seems to intimate to have been taken up by the *Hereticks* also. This shews how inclinable the *Christians* were to entertain the same Notions of their *Baptism*, where they had no warning given them to the contrary by any *Revelation* of the *Gospel*, which is not so much as pretended in this Case.

There was also a *third* condition requisite to qualifie, even *separate Souls*, for the benefits of *Christianity*. That is, an actual and explicit *Repentance* of their *Idolatry* and worship of *Devils*, for those who had been actually guilty of it, how well soever they meant, when that was their Case. Other sins were purged by a general *Repentance* upon their first initiation into the Church by their *baptismal Washing*, without any particular satisfaction for what was past. But this *Communion* with the *Devil* made them Members of that Body, of which the *Devil* was the Head, which their *baptismal Profession* obliged them expressly to renounce, before they could be received into that new *Mystical Body* of which our Blessed Saviour is the Head. This therefore was requisite to be their own express Act, and Personal,

43.

Renuncia-
tion of the
Devil ne-
cessary for
the Spirit,
which was
also believ-
ed perform-
able in the
separate
state, by
those who
could not
know their
Duty be-
fore.

as

The Distinction between

as those had been of their *Communion* with the *Devil*, by which they had entitled themselves to *share* in that *Fire*, which was *not* prepared for *them*, but for the *Devil* and his *Angels*; and for them *no otherwise*, than as they had, by their *own* Act, made their *own* Cause the same with *his*. But when they *had* done so, it was, in *reason*, to be expected that they should, by the like *express* Acts of their own, rescind what they had done formerly, in order to the *disengaging* themselves from the pernicious Consequences to which they had thereby made themselves obnoxious. Till they had done so, they were incapable of that *Communion* with *Christ*, which was to entitle them to the benefits of his *Death*, and the *Life* and *Immortality* purchased by it. I easily foresee how apt our *Adversaries* are to make the Case of *separate* Souls extraordinary, and therefore accountable by no other *means* but such as are, like the Case it self, *extraordinary* also. And so there may indeed be *reason* to reckon it as to what is *Extraordinary* in it, that *Overtures* should be made to them in the state of actual *Separation*. That must *not* indeed be *expected* by *them*, who have had the *Gospel* sufficiently notified to them while they were in their *Bodies*. Their determination *here* must conclude then for ever. That may make their Case *seem* Extraordinary, if our *present* Case be taken

taken for the *Standard* of what is *Ordinary*. Otherwise, if the *Rule* of the *greatest numbers* be taken for the *Ordinary Rule*, that may perhaps, have as good a Title to the name of *Ordinary* as *ours*. It is reasonable to believe, that it was as *constant* in all who lived before our Saviour's *Incarnation*, as *ours* is in all who lived *since* the *publication* of the *Gospel*, who *heard* of it. And the *numbers* of those who lived in so many *generations* before, must needs be greater than the *numbers* of those who lived *since*, and *heard* of the *Gospel*. It must therefore have been, at least, as *ordinary* a *Rule* then, as *ours* is now. However this is very reasonable, that, seeing the *future immortal Cælestial Life*, and the *Spirit* as the *cause* of it, are only attainable by the *Gospel*; they should be attained by the *means* and *qualifications* prescrib'd by the *Gospel*. Nor can it be denyed but that these three, of *Faith* and *Water-Baptism*, and *Renunciation* of our past *νομινα* with the *Devil*, the capital *Adversary* of our Saviour, are plainly supposed and required by the *Constitution* of the *new Peculium*. And equitable *Dispensations* with the known *Laws* of a *Society*, are never designed by *Legislators* but for *rare Cases* which *cannot* be provided for by *general Rules*, and wherein therefore *few Persons* may be concerned. To do otherwise would encourage *breaches* of the *Law*,
if

if very many might expect the *favour* of the *Legislator*, and that *ordinarily*, and in *course*. Much more if the *numbers* of such *Favourites* were greater than of those who lay claim to his *favour* in the *ordinary* and *allowed* way of gaining his *Favour*, that of *keeping* his *Commandments*. It would be a reflection on the *Wisdom* and the *foresight* of the *Legislator*, to leave *great numbers* destitute of a *Rule* to go by. And much *more* so, if they were *more* who might expect the protection and *favour* of his *Society*, in the notorious *breach* of his *Laws*, than in observing them. Other *Secular Governments* do indeed secure their *main* ends, if they can secure the *performance* of their *Laws* by their *Subjects* in *this* *Life*, at least, as to a *majority* of their *Subjects*. The reason is, because all *Duties* to such *Societies* *expire* with *this* *Life*, beyond which the *Rewards* and *Punishments* do not *extend*. But that is not the *Case* with *Souls*, whose *main* concern relates to the *future* *Life*, and to this *Life* no otherwise than as their behaviour *here* may contribute to the *Happiness* or *Infelicity* of the *Future* *State*. It is therefore very agreeable that even separate *Souls* should be obliged to comply with the *means* prescribed by the *Gospel*, in order to the attaining that *Immortality* which was not otherwise attainable than by the *Gospel*. This therefore is a further inducement to make the *Fact* appear credi-

credible, which is otherwise so well attested by witnesses of that Apostolical Age.

Thus therefore it appears, that *separate Souls* of Persons who dyed before the *Incar-* nation, received the *immortalizing Principle* in their *separate State*; and that this was actually *believed* in those *earliest* times. *Clemens* observes further, from this passage of *Hermas*, that others as well as *Jews*, were allowed the *Benefit* as well as *Favour* of it. His words are: *Ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ ἀπλῶς*

44.
The Gen-
tiles also
are owned
by Hermas
to have re-
ceived the
Spirit by
our Savi-
our's Bap-
tism in
their sepa-
rate State.

*ὅτι τῷ κηρυγμῶν δεῖς τῶν λέξιν, δικαίως οἶδα
πᾶς ἐν ἔθνεσι καὶ ἐν Ἰουδαίοις, καὶ μόνον πρὸς
τῷ κυρίῳ παρουσίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς νόμῳ, καὶ
τῶν πρὸς θεὸν εὐαρέσῃσιν, ὡς Ἀβελ, ὡς Νῶε,
ὡς εἰ τις ἕτερος δικαιοῦς.* Strom. ii. p. 163.

Hermas makes no express mention of *Abel* or *Noah*. But the words alluded to by *Clemens* are these: *Decem, qui in fundamen-
tis collocati sunt, primum seculum est. Sequen-
tes viginti quinque, secundum seculum est iustorum
virovum, L. iii. Simil. ix. n. 15.* The first *Ten* are the *Ante-diluvian Patriarchs*, among whom *Abel* may be reckoned to fill up the number, if *Adam* be excluded, who first forfeited the Spirit. For so he adds afterwards: *Hi primi Spiritus illos portaverunt,
& omnino alius ab alio non recesserunt, nec
Spiritus ab hominibus, nec homines à Spiri-
tibus; sed juncti fuerunt hi Spiritus eis
usq; ad diem quietis: qui, nisi hos Spiritus
secum habuissent, non fuissent utiles structuræ
turris*

The Distinction between

turris hujus. This was not true of *Adam*, but of the rest it was ; because the Desertion of the *Spirit* from the *generality* of *Mankind* was *first* in the days of *Noah*, as I have already observed. And the *justi* of the *second Seculum* are the Persons alluded to by *Clemens* in the words, εἰ τις ἔτερον δικαιοῦται. These are the Persons alluded to by *S. Paul*, *Heb. xi.* and commended by him on account of their having *pleased God* by *Faith. v. 5, 6.* Plainly in opposition to the *Law*; and therefore on the *same Terms* with the *Gentiles* under the *new Peculium*. And he urges, to this purpose, their *living* before the *Law*, meaning, not only the *Law of Moses*, but the *Law of Circumcision* given to *Abraham*, by which the first *confinement* of the *Peculium* was made to a particular Nation. Thus *Clemens* does not *misunderstand* nor *misapply* this place of *Hermas*, though that Author himself has no express mention of the *Gentiles*. It is withal observable, that *Hermas* owns these first *Patriarchs* to have *had* the *Spirit*, and that to the time of their *Death*, as neither having deserted by his conduct, nor having *been deserted* by him. Yet even these he makes *dead* in reference to the *Spirit* conferred on them by the *Apostles* in the state of *Separation*. The *Apostles* who had received our *Saviour's Baptism* on *Earth* are therefore said in this Baptism of these *separate Souls*, to descend into the Water
alive

alive, and to rise out of the same Water alive also. Not so these just *Patriarchs*, who had this *Spirit*, and who had been so punctually *obedient* to it, as never to have been *deserted* by it. Yet even they wanted the *quickning Spirit* of our *Saviour*, till it was conferred upon them by that *Baptism* of our *Saviour*, which was administered to them by his *Apostles*. They could not have been said to have been *dead* when they *descended* into the *Baptismal Water*, if in their *descent*, they had already received that same *quickning Spirit*, which made them *alive* when they *ascended* out of that same *Water*. The *Spirit* therefore received by them *before* was only *External*, not an *inward animating Principle* of a *new and immortal Life*, which might entitle them to *Heaven*, the *Seat of Immortality*. This is no more than what the *Apostle* teaches us when he tells us, that they *received not the Promise*; *God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect*, *Heb. xi. 39, 40*. What is this *Promise*? No other than the *τῆς δέου καὶ νεο-νομίας*, as *Philo* expresses it: The *Heavenly Canaan*, and the *New Jerusalem* from above, the proper residence of the *Man from Heaven*: *The City which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God, v. 10*. The *better Country, that is, the Heavenly, prepared for them by God, v. 16*. In regard of which
he

he only sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange Countrey, dwelling in Tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same Promise, v. 9. Their dwelling in Tabernacles, is insisted on as an Argument of their *not possessing* that Land as *Inhabitants*, but as *Sojourners*. And this again is urged to prove, That they *died in Faith*, *not having received the Promises*, but *having seen them afar off*. As their dwelling in *Tabernacles* is urged to prove, That they *confessed* that they were *Strangers and Pilgrims* in the *Earth*, v. 13. *Heaven* therefore is the Promise here intended, which therefore they had not yet attained, who had not yet received the Promise. And the *Spirit* also is a Promise, as it is a necessary *qualification* for *Heaven* it self. The Promise of the Father, S. Luke xxiv. 49. Act. i. 4. ii. 33. And therefore, as a *Promise of the Father*, promised not only by the Son, but by the Father also, in the *Mystical Interpretations* of the *Old Testament*, without which the other *Mystical Promise* of *Heaven* could not be performed to them. The exceeding great and precious Promise, by which we are *partakers of the Divine Nature*. 2. S. Pet. i. 4. That very *Spirit* which is the *Prerogative* of our *Saviour's Baptism*. So the *Apostle* very expressly: *In whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Spirit of Promise, which is the earnest of our Inheritance,*

tance, Eph. i. 13, 14. The Earnest must necessarily go before the Inheritance. Yet that very Earnest could not be receiv'd by these Patriarchs till they had heard and believed the Gospel, and had also received the Seal of Baptism. All which our Apostolical Author *Hermas* makes performed to their Souls in the state of Separation. Yet *Hermas* owns that the same Patriarchs had deceased in Righteousness and in great Purity: ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἐκοιμήθησαν, καὶ ἐν μεγάλῃ ἀγνείᾳ. These are very proper dispositions for receiving the Divine Spirit. Yet they are not all, he owned formerly that they had the Spirit, and had ne'er deserted him, nor been deserted by him. How then comes it to pass that he makes them dead at their descent into the Baptismal Water? That he makes them quickned by the Apostles who baptized them? So himself owns in the following words: Διὰ τούτων ἐν ἑξωποικίθησαν καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. So he supposes, when he makes them ascend alive out of the same Baptismal Water into which they had descended dead. He gives the Answer himself: That, notwithstanding these advantages, they still wanted the Seal of Baptism: Μόνον δὲ τῇ σφραγίδι ταύτην ἐκῆχον. We see here clearly, That having the Spirit as a Guide and an external Assistant, is not alone sufficient to entitle to that Life that is Immortal by these Principles. Our

O

having

having it so can only put us into that *condition* wherein *Adam* was before his fall, which was only a *mean* between *Mortality* and *Immortality*, indifferent to *either*. But the *immortalizing Principle* is the *Spirit*, as initiating us into a *new Life*, as a new *animating vital Principle*. So it is a *Principle* of a *new Birth* and a *Regeneration*. And so it is not to be expected any other way, than by our *Saviour's Baptism*, by the *Doctrine* of the *New Testament*.

45. But our *Saviour's Preaching*, lasting only while his *Soul* together with his *Spirit* was in that *superiour Adns* (which was the *Receptacle* of the *better Souls* who were *qualified* for his *Favour*, according to the *Opinion* of *Clemens Alexandrinus*) could therefore be presumed beneficial *only* to the *Jews* who were *then* the *only Peculium*. Our *Saviour's* first *Commission* to his *Apostles* was: *Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any City of the Samaritans enter ye not. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel*, S. *Matth.* x. 6. He plainly here confines their *Preaching* to the *Jews*, so as to *forbid* it to either of their *Rivals*: either the *Gentiles*, or even the *Samaritans*. Not only so, He owns the *confinement* of his *own Commission* to them *alone*. So he answers the *Canaanitish Woman*; *I am not sent, but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.* xv. 24. So it was for the *time* of our *Saviour*. And though

Our Saviour's Preaching was only to the Souls of the Jews, the Apostles, was also to those of the Gentiles, according to the Doctrine of Clemens Alexandrinus.

though he himself gave *intimations* that the *Gentiles* should afterwards be admitted *immediately* to the *same* Privileges; yet they were (for preventing the *Præjudices* he knew them *then* possessed with against it) in such wary *Expressions*, that even the *Apostles* themselves were not, without *difficulty* induced, even then, either to *receive*, or *preach* to, the *Gentiles*. This therefore gives a clear account of the Doctrine of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, why he ascribes the *preaching* to the *Jews* in *Adms* to our *Saviour*; but that to the *Gentiles*, to the *Apostles*, and other principal *Doctors* under the *new* Dispensation. His words are: Δέδεικται ὅ καὶ τῷ δευτέρῳ Στρωματῇ [p. 163.] τὰς Ἀποστόλους, ἀκολούθως τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ τὰς ἐν αὐτῷ εὐηγγελισμένους. Ἐχρῆν γὰρ, οἶμαι, καὶ ὥσπερ καὶ πάντα ἔτις ὃ κακῆσε τὰς ἀρεῖας τῶν μαθητῶν μιμητὰς γενέσθαι τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ· ἢ ὁ μὲν, τὰς ἐξ Ἑβραίων οἱ ὅ, τὰ ἔθνη εἰς ὀπισθοφρὴν ἀγαγῶσι τέλει, τὰς ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, τῇ κατὰ νόμον καὶ κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν, βεβιωκότας μὲν, καὶ τελείως ὅ, ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτηκῶς, διαπεπραγαμένους τὸ βίον. Τῷ γὰρ ἐπρεπεῖν τῇ θεαοικονομίᾳ, τὰς ἀξίαν μᾶλλον ἐχρηκότας ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ προηγμένους βεβιωκότας, ὅτι τε τοῖς πλημμεληθεῖσι μέλανενοηκότας, καὶ ἐν ἄλλῳ τόπῳ τύχουσιν ἐξομολογημένους ἐν τοῖς τῷ θεῷ ὄντας τῷ παντοκράτορι, κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐκείνη γινώσκιν σωθῆναι, *Str. vi. p. 271.* The *Doctrines* of *Profelyting* and *receiving* *Gentiles* into the

new Peculium were first reveal'd clearly, after our Saviour's *Ascension*, in the time of the *preaching* of the *Apostles*. And accordingly the *Extraordinary Apostles*, S. *Paul* and S. *Barnabas*, began the *Practice* of *Preaching* to the *Gentiles*, in *Act. xiii.* The other *Apostles* learned this *Doctrine* from them, as they had done the other of *admitting Gentile Profelytes* from S. *Peter*, and his *success* also in the case of *Cornelius*. But they did not put it in *Practice* till 12 Years after our Saviour's *Ascension*, if we may believe the antient *Tradition* of *Apollonius* in *Eusebius*, and the very antient *Apocryphal Book* concerning the *Preaching* of S. *Peter*, observed by *Clement* himself. Thenceforward therefore they were *prepared* for performing the *same Office* of *Preaching* to the *deceased Gentiles*, as themselves *deceased*, which they had performed *before* to their *living Posterity*, whilst themselves were *living*. This was very agreeable to the *Notions* of those *Times*, that *separate Souls* retained the *habitual impressions* contracted here, and were therefore delighted in doing the *same things* in the state of *Separation*, which had been acceptable to them in *this World*. And it was very proper that this *Office* should be performed by our *Blessed Saviour himself* and his *Apostles*, because they are the *True Catholick Church*, from whom all *particular Churches* derive their Title to *Catholicism*,

licism, by their *Communion* with *them* who have the *Archetypal Communion* with the *Father* and the *Son*, as I have shewn in my *Parænesis*. For *separate Souls* are *uncapable* of the *mediate Communion*, which is sufficient to make our *Visible Churches Catholick*, by *Visible Symbols*, administred by *Visible Authorized Representatives* of the *Heads* of the *Mystical Communion*, the *Father* and the *Son*. And therefore can be *united* to them *no* otherwise than by an *immediate Union*, if they be admitted to any *Union* at all. He adds withal, that it is the employment of our *Lord*, as a *Saviour*, to save his own *Workmanship*, where-ever they are, that is, whether in the *Body* or *out* of it, by drawing them εἰς σωτηρίαν. And indeed the σωτηρία from *Matter*, and *fleshly Lusts* as the *Nails* to *Matter*, hindring the *Ascent* of *Souls* to *Heaven*, is owned by the *Philosophers*, and ascribed by *them* to the Λόγος as well as by the *Scriptures*. They also were sensible of their duty of *following God*, and *disposing* themselves for it by *Purity* of *Flesh* and *Spirit*. They expected a *Union* with *God* by these *Purgations*. So *Porphry* in his *Life* of *Plotinus*, pretends himself twice to have enjoyed this *Union*, and *S. Justin Martyr* expected it, *before* his *Conversion* to the *Christian Religion*, by his *Philosophical Purgations*, as himself informs us in his *Dialogue* with *Tryphon*. And they who

practised them were stiled θεοί, and were thought to have *Divine* and *Theurgical* Vertues as well as others, as being thereby made themselves *Divine*, which must therefore entitle them to *Heaven* upon their *Dissolution* from their *Bodies*. He further adds, That the *Punishments* inflicted by God on the *Gentiles* in their *separate State*, were σωτήριοι, and παιδεύσεις, and εἰς ἐμπροσθεν ἄγασαι. The word ἐμπροσθεν is thus used by the *Philosophers*, as well as the *Sacred Writers*, for a *Conversion* of their Thoughts from *Worldly* to *Heavenly* Objects, To which he subjoins a farther advantage of the *separate State* for this purpose, that *Souls* in that condition can see more clearly, though darkned by remaining habituated *Passions*, on this very account, that they are not diverted by attending to the *fleshly Principle*: διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐπὶ ἐμπροσθεν εἶδαι σαφῶς. He mentions also the Argument from God's being no *Acceptor of Persons*, which is the same that is observed by S. Peter in the Case of *Cornelius*, *Act. x. 34*. And allowed by St. Paul, *Rom, ii. 11*, And with this very application to the Case of *Jews* and *Gentiles*. That in relation to *Souls*, and the concerns of the *future State*, *Gentiles* are as acceptable to him as *Jews*. That is, That in every Nation, he that feareth him, and worketh Righteousness is accepted with him, *Act. x. 35*. as S. Peter himself interprets

prets that Phrase. The Privileges therefore of the *Jews*, as a *Peculium*, ought not so to be understood as to be inconsistent with this, because God never was an *Acceptor of Persons*. And the *Primitive Writers*, and the *Apostle* in *Heb. xi.* prove it from so many of the *Patriarchs* as were *εὐάρεστοι* to him, before he was pleased to fix upon a *Peculium*, and have the name of *Righteous* ascribed to them in the *Scriptures* themselves, as *Noah*, *Lot*, *Job*, and others. Accordingly he distinguishes between two *Righteousnesses*, κατὰ νόμον and κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν, and makes *Philosophy* to have the same power for qualifying the *Gentiles* for the Favour of the *Gospel*, that the *Law* had for the *Jews*. Or, if *Righteousness* must necessarily have a relation to a *Law*; yet even so, *living well* is the same thing as *living Legally*; and a *living* according to the *Rule of right Reason*, the same with *living* according to *Law*. So he: εἰ γὰρ τὸ καλῶς βίβν, καὶ νομίμως ἔστι βίβν· καὶ τὸ εὐλογως βίβν, κατὰ νόμον ἔστι βίβν· Ὁρθῶς δὲ βεβαιώτες οἱ περὶ νόμου εἰς πίστιν ἐργάσθησαν, καὶ δικαιοὶ εἶναι ἐκλήθησαν. This *Life* was imputed to them for *Faith*, so far as they were capable of *Faith* without a *Preacher*, by the *Reasoning* of the *Apostle*, in *Heb. xi.* And that *Faith* was imputable to them for *Righteousness*. I see nothing in this *Hypothesis* of *S. Clement*, but what is allowable by the *Doctrine* of the *New Testament*.

46. But the *Foundation* of this whole Discourse, seems to be grounded on the *original Equality* of all *Humane Souls*, of those who were *without*, as well as of those who were *within*, the *Old Peculium*. Both sorts bore *originally* the *εἰκὼν* of *Adam*, and could pretend to nothing *higher*, than what they could derive from *him*. Nor could the *Jews* pretend to any *Dignity* of their *Souls* above the *Gentiles*, as descended from their proper *National Patriarchs*. No *εἰκὼν* from any of them, distinct from that which was common to the *Gentiles*, as well as *them*, from *Adam*. This made it look like *accepting of Persons*, if God had dealt so *unequally*, in distributing these *greatest* of his *Favours* to *Persons* who had otherwile so *equal* Pretensions to them. That *they* were also the *Divine Off-spring*, is owned by *S Paul*, when he quotes the Passage of *Aratus* the *Poet* to that Purpose with *Approbation*. This made them all alike entitled to the Care of *Divine Providence*. Accordingly, when the *Apostle* speaks of the *πνεῦμα*, the Principle of *Immortality*, as the *εἰκὼν* of the *λόγος*, and therefore deriveable only from *him*; he opposes it only to the *ψυχή*, which he calls the *εἰκὼν* of *Adam*. What can be more obvious from hence, than that he did not here consider *Man* as descended from any *subordinate Patriarch*, but as the Seed of *Adam*,

No Patri-
archal Co-
venant can
oblige Po-
sterity to
consent to
the Hazard
of Eternal
Misery.

to whom the *Gentiles* had as fair a Claim as the *Jews* themselves ? The *Old Peculium* therefore could not, in Affairs relating to *Souls immediately*, challenge any *Privilege*, on account of their *proper Patriarchs*, and the *particular Covenants* made by God with *them*. Not one of *those Covenants* ever mention any thing relating to the *separate Condition* of *single Souls*. All of them concern *Posterity* as *Bodies*, and are sufficiently satisfied in the good or ill *Successes* of the *Bodies*, how *anomalous* soever the Case might be of *single Members* of those *Bodies*. They might be *happy* in the *Calamities* of their *Nation*; and on the contrary, very *unhappy* under the *prosperous Successes* of the *Publick*, notwithstanding their own strict *Observance* of their *Duty*; nay, for that very Reason, because they did observe it. Many *Heroical Virtues*, are Occasions of *Personal Calamities*. Withal the *Interests* of *private Persons*, are *inconsistent* with those of the *Publick*. And in *these Cases*, the *better* the *Men* are, the *more* they must think *themselves* obliged to submit to what may make their *Persons miserable*, when their *Private Happiness* is *inconsistent* with that of the *Publick*, or where their *private Calamities* may promote the *Prosperity* of their *Nation*, and their *Country*. But then this can only hold in such Cases, wherein, all things consider'd,
the

The Distinction between

the *Publick* Good may *Countervail* their own *private Inconveniences*, and wherein they *themselves* may have *Reason* to believe it a sufficient *Compensation* for what they *suffer* by it. And so they may, while the Evil is *finite*, and can reach no farther than their *Bodies*, though it be *Death* it self, and that with *Torment* too. And it has been often thought so by *wise* and *Considerate* Persons. The continued *Protection* of their *whole Lives*, and the *Honour* thereby purchased to their *Memory*, and the *Favour* to their *Posterity* and *Friends*, and *Well-wishers*, and even the Good of the *Publick* itself, may be judged a sufficient *Compensation* in the *Opinion* of grateful Persons, who value the *Publick* beyond all *Posterity*, or *private Benefactions*. But *Eternal Misery*, of what *Degree* soever, can admit of no possible *Compensation*, even in the *Judgment* of *reasonable Gratitude*. And what is *unreasonable* cannot, for that *Reason*, be thought *virtuous* or *commendable*. Here therefore every *private* Person must judge ultimately by his *private Interests*. For no *Publick Law* can *oblige* any further than its *Rewards* and *Punishments*: That is, than its *Rewards* may be great enough to make *Amends* for all the *Evils* that may be incurred by *complying* with it; and its *Punishments* greater than can be *recompensed* by all the *Advantages* that may be *gained* by *Disobedience*. But
Eternal

Eternal Misery cannot be countervail'd by any Legal Rewards of Obedience. No Patriarchal Covenant therefore can oblige Posterity to submit to Eternal Misery, on Consideration of any Publick Interest whatsoever of the Patriarchal Family. Nor can it therefore undertake for their Posterity, in such a case where any single Soul may be exposed for the Good of the Community. The Covenants thereof, of this kind, must be transacted with each single Individual, so as to put it in his own Power, whether he will, or will not, be eternally miserable. What may be done by God's absolute Power, I am not now concerned to enquire. It is sufficient for my Purpose at present, that even God's proceeding at that rate, is not agreeable to those Rules of Justice and Equity received among Men, which even he himself owns and appeals to in the Scriptures, as the Measures of his Proceedings with his reasonable Creatures. No Man can reasonably submit his Eternal Interests to the Hazards of another's fallible Judgment and flexible Free-will, on any Consideration whatsoever of other Advantages. Nor can God's Goodness permit him to necessitate a reasonable Creature to act contrary to the Nature with which he has endued it; that is, to submit to the Determination of another, in such a case where no rightly inform'd Understanding can judge a Submission reasonable.

ble. This is therefore a Case wherein every *single* Rational Being, has a *Right* to determine for it self, and *not* to be *concluded* by the *Act* of any *Patriarchal* Ancestors.

47. But in other Cases whereby *Rights* are gained by *Posterity*, sufficient to make *Amends* for any consequential *Inconveniences*; it is but *reasonable*, that where *Posterity* gain *Rights* by the *Acts* of their *Predecessors*, they should be *obliged* to bear with such *consequential Inconveniences*. But this can reach no farther than what they have *received* from their *Fore-fathers*, which is their *Bodies*, which being, as *derived* from them, confessedly *Mortal*, can expose them to no *Sufferings*, that can be *Eternal*. As for their *Souls*, if they be derived also from their *Ancestors*, that very Consideration alone would be sufficient to prove them *Mortal*, by the *Reasonings* of those *Ages* we are speaking of, of the greatest *Authority*. But if they be indeed *Immortal*; so far, as they are so, they could not be derived from their *Parents*, nor could they *consequently* be liable to all *Obligations* contracted by their *Ancestors*. However by their *Bodies*, the *Posterity* of the *Old Peculium* had great *advantages* above the *rest* of *Mankind*, even with Relation to *God*, and *Conveniences* for their *Souls*. Their *Nation* was taken *immediately* into the *Divine Protection* of the *Supreme Being*; not *mediately*, like
other

God appropriating the Old Peculium did not exclude the Gentiles then living from the Benefits of the New Peculium relating to their Souls.

other Nations. This secured them of a more powerful Patron, whenever their *Interests* should be *inconsistent* with the *Interests* of any *other* rival *Nations*. Then their *Government* was *Theocratical*, so long as themselves endured it should be so; that God himself *nominated* the *Persons* that should be their *Supreme Governours*, who could not fail of *choosing* fit *Persons* for that Purpose, as *themselves* did, when he was prevailed on *afterwards*, by their Importunity, to *permit* the *Government* to the Hazards of an *Hereditary Succession*. Yet even then they had the Assistance of *Divine Oracles*, for the *Direction* of the *Governours*, for the *time being*, so long, as they were willing to be *guided by them*, even for their *Secular Affairs*. That of *Urim* in the *High-Priest*, and of their *Prophets*, empower'd with sufficient *Credentials* to prove their *Divine Mission*, and these surer than those which were given to *other Nations*, by inferiour subordinate *Demons*. Withal, that the *Messiah*, the *Incarnate Logos*, the great *Restorer* of Souls, was to derive his *Flesh* from *them*. This was a great Endearment of them to him, and gave them a great Security for *expecting Favours* from him, according to the received *Notions* of those *Times*, concerning the *Duties* good Men were obliged to pay to their *Nations* and *Countries*. Yet our Saviour very frequently

ly gives them warning not to reckon on this *Carnal* Relation, and signifies that good *Dispositions* of *Mind* were much more valuable to him, where-ever he found them, in reference to the End of his own Coming. He seems to check his own *Mother*, when she concerned her self in the Exercise of a Power greater than any he had *derived* from her. He prefers the Case of *hearing* the word and *keeping* it, before that of the *Womb* that *bore* him, and the *Paps* that had given him *suck*. Such he owns for his *Mothers*, his *Sisters* and his *Brethren*, rather than those who had those Relations to his *Flesh*. He values *Nathanael* more on account of his being a *true Israelite*, and $\alpha\delta\delta\lambda\textcircled{G}$ without any Indications of *νοθεια* and *degeneracy* from his famous *Ancestors*, than on account of his *Extraction* from them. This is the *true Israelitism*, which is so often afterwards *opposed* to *Israelitism* according to the *Flesh*, the *Seed* of *Abraham's Faith*, which he had *while he was yet uncircumcised*. So he declares his Approbation of the *Faith* of the *Syrophænician Canaanitish Woman*, after he had seemed to upbraid her with her *Descent*, and try'd her *Constancy* in *bearing* the *Reproach*. And in the Case of the *Centurion*, he wonders and declares, that he had not found so great *Faith*, *no not in Israel*. Plainly intimating *that* to be *more esteemed* by him, than being *descended* from *Israel*. Thence
he

he takes occasion to foretel the Reception of the *Gentiles* into the *Peculium*; that *many* should come from the East and West, and should sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob [the so much boasted *Patriarchs* of the *Jews*] in the Kingdom of Heaven, when the Children of the Kingdom should be cast out into outer Darknes. Which plainly shews, that our Blessed Lord never had the *less* regard to eminent *Examples* of *Virtue* among the *Gentiles*, on that account, that they were not of the *chosen Seed*. On the contrary, he rather seems to *censure* that *Confinement* of their common Offices of *Humanity* to their *own* beloved *Nation*, when he recommends the Behaviour of the good *Samaritan* to the wounded Man, beyond that of the *Priest* and *Levite*, who passed by unconcerned, because he was no *Jew*, when the *Samaritan* had *pity* on him, though *not* more nearly ally'd to him, than they were, on a *National* Account. Rather he *prefers* that *Virtue* which he finds where he had *least* Reason to expect it, where himself had bestowed the *least* Cultivation. There is therefore no reason to expect that our Blessed Saviour should *con-*
fine his Design, as a Saviour of Souls, only to the Souls of the *Old Peculium*. In truth, the whole Ground of the *chusing* that *Peculium* it self, was, that he might thereby reward the *Moral Virtues* of their *Ancestors*.
God

The Distinction between

God himself owns the *Faith* of *Abraham*, the *Father* of the *Faithful*, in being willing to part with his only *Son*, when God was pleased to require him, as the *Reason* of *chusing* his *Posterity* for his *Peculium*. *Because thou hast done this thing, and hast not with-held thy Son, thine only Son : In blessing, I will bless thee ; and in multiplying, I will multiply thy Seed as the Stars of Heaven, and as the Sand which is upon the Sea shore ; and thy Seed shall possess the Gate of his Enemies : And in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my Voice ; Gen. xxii. 16, 17, 18.* These last Words are applied to *Christ* himself by the *Apostle*, *Gal. iii. 16.* By which we understand that the Interest the *Jews* had, even in the *Flesh* of *Christ*, and all the *Honours* and *Favours* resulting from thence, were the *Rewards* of that *Personal Act* of *Abraham*. But this was indeed after his *Circumcision*. However there are the like *Promises* made to him, upon his *first Act* of *Faith* in leaving his *Country* at *God's Command* (that very *Particular* not excepted, which relates to *Christ*) that *in him all the Families of the Earth should be blessed*, *Gen. xii. 1. 2, 3.* This was before his *Circumcision*, on account of that *Faith* which he had, being yet *uncircumcised*, *Rom. x. 9, 10.* on which account all who are the *Children* of his *Faith* are as much entitled to the *Promises*

Promises made to him and his Seed, by the Reasonings of the New Testament, and of the first Fathers, as the Jews themselves. And though Circumcision had been necessary to entitle to that Covenant, of which Circumcision was a Seal: yet it was not the Circumcision of the Flesh, but of the Spirit, that was the true Mystical Circumcision, which was the Circumcision that was acceptable to God, by the same Reasonings of the New Testament. And of this Circumcision, Gentiles were as capable as the Jews themselves. And these Reasonings, in both Cases, are grounded on Testimonies of the Old Testament, proving these Interpretations agreeable to the Mind of the Legislator, even then, as the Reasonings of the New Testament generally prove those things which the Jews took for Innovations in the Revelations of the Gospel, to be so far from being really Innovations, as that they were also always more designed by God, and more antiently so, than the literal Interpretation of the Law, which seemed so inconsistent with them. These Rules of Reasoning will reach the Gentiles who lived then, as to the Equity of them, as well as those who lived after the Promulgation of the Gospel. And, in truth, I cannot imagine what Abraham could have for recommending the first acts of Faith, which entitled him to the following confining Covenant with

P him

him and his Children, that could not be pleadable with as much *Equity* for any *Gentile Patriarch* then living, who had been [as good as *Abraham*, as it was for *Abraham* himself. And, though there was no *Patriarch* then living, who gave the same *Evidence* of his absolute *Resignation* to God by any outward Act, as *Abraham* did, that could not, in *Equity*, be any *Exception* against the *Acceptableness* of the like *Heroical* Acts of any of the *Posterity* of such *Patriarchs*, who had no *Promise* or *Covenant* for *Acceptance* derived from their *Ancestors*. However such *pious Successors* were in the same *Condition*, as to their *single* Persons, as *Abraham* was, before the *Covenant* that appropriated the *Old Peculium*. And therefore had the same *Plea* for *Acceptance*, as he had, in *Equity*: especially with him, who, in this very Case, professes himself to be no *Acceptor of Persons*. And, however they might fail of a Title by their *carnal* *Ancestors*; yet they had one by *Abraham* himself (as many of them, at least, as lived after him) by these *Christian Reasonings*. They were also the *Sons* of his *Faith*, though not of his *Flesh*. They had the true *Seal* of the *Circumcision*, not of the *Flesh*, but of the *Spirit*, which even the *Prophets* themselves of the *Old Testament* look on as the *truly beneficial Circumcision*. And, by this means, they must also be qualified

lified to be *Members* of that *Mystical Body*, of which our *Saviour* is the *Mystical Head*, which will, in *Consequence*, entitle them to the *Spirit*, that they who are *one Body* in *him*, may be *one Spirit* in *him* also. I know not how this *Reasoning* can be avoided, in Relation to the *Mystical Benefits* of even that *Peculium*, of which kind all *they* are that relate to the *future State*. And such *alone* are they for which the *Writers* of the *New Testament* are concerned. They did not rival the *Jews* in their Title to the *Earthly*, but the *Heavenly Canaan*; not to the *Earthly*, but the *Heavenly Jerusalem*. This *Reasoning* therefore did not hinder but that *Carnal Extraction* from *Abraham*, or an *Incorporation* into his *Patriarchal Body* by a *Carnal Circumcision*, were the only *Legal Means* that could convey a *Right* to the *Earthly Canaan*, and the *Earthly Jerusalem*: Nor did they hinder, but that even that *Relation* to our *Saviour's Flesh*, and *their* being the *natural Olive* into which *others* were to be *inoculated*, at least *mystically*, in order to a *Participation* of their *mystical Sap* and *Fatness*, were great *Prerogatives* of the *Jewish Nation*. Nor does the *Apostle* ever allow them *more*, even when he is most liberal in his *Concessions* to *them*. He never owns any *Advantage* of theirs above the *Gentiles*, as to *purely Spirituals*, and, in regard to the *State* of their *separate*

The Distinction between

Souls, supposing equal Dispositions in both Cases. Nor does he suppose this spiritual Equality preached by the Gospel, to have begun with the Promulgation of the Gospel, but to have been as old as the Gospel it self, before Ages and Generations, and before the Foundation of the World. Plainly implying it, as to God's Design of it, to have been elder than the Law of Moses, or the eldest Foot-steps of that which was commonly taken for the elder Peculium. This is sufficient for my Purpose to shew the Probability that God never intended to exclude the Gentiles from the Benefits their Souls might receive by our Saviour's Incarnation. Not even those, who were not then incorporated into the Jewish Nation, by a Carnal Circumcision. Which being supposed, the Assertion of S. Clement cannot be thought strange, that Philosophy might perform the same Office for the Gentiles, which the Law of Moses did for the Jews, in preparing them for the Spirit, which neither of them could receive as an immortalizing Principle, but by the Gospel. What is this Philosophy but the Moral Duties of the Mosaic Law, being owned as reasonable and obliging by the Philosophers, who were the Guides of those Gentiles who knew nothing of the Law of Moses? And what is this but the Law written in their Hearts, which the Apostle owns as sufficient to make it Law to those who find it

it

it so? This doing the *things* prescribed in the *Law*, under the Sense of an *inward Conviction*, that they were obliged to do so, seems to be what God *himself* calls *having his Law written in their Hearts*, and wishes earnestly that it were his *Peoples Case*. Why then should we wonder if it should prove *acceptable* to him in the *Gentiles* also?

The *Scripture* therefore *supposes* all other 48.
 Humane Souls equal with *those* of the old *Peculium*; and that it would be *acceptance* of *Persons* with God to treat *equal Souls* with *unequal Favours*, when considered *singly*, without relation to the *Bodies* to which they belong. It owns no *inequality* in *Mankind* in general, but what is made by that *Accession* of the *Spirit*, as an *animating Principle* of *new Life*, which is not given but by our *Saviour's Baptism*, and is therefore proper to our *new Peculium*. But you desire to know how this *accessional Spirit* is distinguished from the *Soul*, and from the *Divine Spirit*, which is the *third Person* in the *Trinity*? I shall therefore endeavour to explain it according to the Sense of the *Scripture*. And indeed as the word *Spirit* signifies *breathing*, by which we live, every Principle of *Life* is called *Spirit*. So there is the *Spirit* of the *Beast*, that *goeth downward to the Earth*, opposed to the *Spirit* of *Man* that

The highest part of the Rational Soul (as distinguished from the Divine Spirit) is called a Spirit, yet naturally mortal.

goeth upward, Eccl. iii. 21. So again, the Spirit of Man, as differing from the Beast, is opposed to the Divine Spirit. What Man knoweth the things of a Man, save the Spirit of a Man which is in him; even so the things of God knoweth no Man, but the Spirit of God, 1 Cor. ii. 11. And, The Spirit beareth Witness with our Spirit, that we are the Children of God, Rom. viii. 16. This may be thought strange, that this supreme Degree in Man, should be contradistinguished from the Divine Spirit. But before I can speak to that, I must first shew what that Principle in Man is, that is called Spirit, and yet opposed to the Divine Spirit. This plainly appears in the place now mentioned, where it is opposed to the Spirit of a Beast. It must therefore be that Power which is proper to Man, and which distinguishes him from the Beasts which have no pretence to it: That is, *Understanding*. Therefore the Beasts are said to have no *Understanding*, Ps. xxxii. 9. And the Man that has no *Understanding*, is said to be like the Beasts that perish, Ps. xlix. 13. 20. That Principle therefore which makes him like Beasts, must make him perishable as they are, and therefore cannot secure him from actual Mortality. That is signified by the Spirit of the Beasts going downward to the Earth. As all the space below the Heaven is called Earth, and is supposed to be the
Region

Region of Death, the צלמה Valley and Shadow of Death, and the Darkneſs of this World, as the World contains the Air alſo. This therefore is the Condition of that Man which was formed out of the Duſt of the Ground, Gen. ii. 7. the χῆς in the Greek. This obliged him to return into the Duſt again, Gen. iii. 19. Eccl. xvii. 1. Wiſd. vii. 1. which is the reaſon why the Gnoſticks made this Choical Man ſo Mortal, as not to ſurvive the Diſſolution of the Body, and therefore to have no place in the future State, not ſo much as in that which they call the State of Mediety, below the Pleroma, the place of the Eternal Aons. This part of the Soul included the concupiſcible and iraciſcible Powers, all that were not Rational. This the Hereticks aſcribed to lower Powers than the Supreme Being; and for that Reaſon made them Mortal. Either the Angels or the Demiurgus, whom they reckon'd for a lower Being, below the Pleroma, were ſuppoſed to be the Authors of them. And that, with this very Deſign, that Man might conſiſt of a Mixture, ſome things Mortal, and ſome Immortal. The Doctrines of the Platonists, whom they followed, was, that whatever was produced by the Supreme Being, could be no other but Immortal. Therefore, that the World might have of both

sorts, other *Inferior* Beings were to be produced (*Mortal* of their own *Nature*, and *Immortal* only by the *Pleasure* of *God*) which were to *produce* those things which were *designed* for *Mortal*. Which *Reasoning* they applied to *Man* the *Microcosm*, as a Being constituted of *Mortals* and *Immortals* also. Nor did the *Hereticks* alone follow herein the *Opinion* of the *Platonists*. *Philo* also is too favourable to it ; but that *Reasoning* is certainly false: For if *God* could not produce *Mortals*, they could never have been produced at all ; because the *first* of them could never have *received* its *Being*, but from something that was *Self-originated* and *Immortal*. I only mention their *Opinion*, to shew that they also were agreed in the *Mortality* of this *lower Soul*. But whether they had been so agreed or not, I am not much concerned. It is sufficient for my Purpose, that the *Scripture* does not countenance it, which, notwithstanding, is sufficiently *clear*, in asserting the *Mortality* of this *lowest Degree* of the *Soul*.

49. And this indeed I take to be that which the *Scripture* calls $\psi\chi\lambda\omega$ simply. For when it has the *Accession* of that *Divine Afflatus*, which is called the *Spirit* of a *Man*, it is then called $\psi\chi\lambda\omega$ ζῶσα. So the Words of *original*,
 yet it is, in a lower Sense, Divine, as being of a Divine Original,
 and as qualifying us for a Union with that truly Divine Spirit, by which we are actually immortalized.

the

the Greek interpreter imply, which is the Text of the *New Testament Writers*: Καὶ ἐπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ ἄνθρωπον, χεὶν ἀπὸ τῆ γῆς· καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν. Gen. ii. 7. Here is an ἄνθρωπος supposed *before* the *Divine breathing*. Certainly not a *dead Man*, which is indeed *no Man*, but a *Man animated* with that lower *Soul*, which is common to *him* and *Beasts*, and therefore cannot be imputed to a *Divine Breathing*. Which was the *Honour*, the Psalmist speaks of, that distinguished him from the *Beasts that perish*. However that *lower Soul* supposes him endued with all those Powers which belong to that *lower Life*, which we call *Animal*, in Opposition to that which is properly *Rational*. It must therefore be a *higher Life* that made that, which before was only *ψυχή* to be now a *ψυχὴ ζῶσα*. And such a *Life* as was worthy of its *Original*, the *πνοὴ ζωῆς* by which it was conveyed; which therefore must be *Divine*, that it might answer its *Divine Original*. In truth, the same *Life* which is given by the *Divine Spirit* it self, only in that *lower Degree*, which is imply'd in the *Phrases* used concerning them, of *ψυχὴ ζῶσα* and *πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖν*. The one only implies a derivative, precarious, dependent, participation of the same *Life*, which is supposed to be so originally in the *πνεῦμα*, as that it can

communicate to others the same Life, of which it self is the original Principle. This πνοή is that which the Fathers, from Is. xlii. 5. suppose to be common to all Mankind. And indeed this Spirit of Man, properly so called, as distinguished from the Spirit of God, is notwithstanding so mentioned in the Scriptures, as a peculiar Honour wherein Man is superiour to all other visible Animals. So it is in the Psalms now mentioned. So in the viiith Psalm, which is a professed Encomium of that Man immediately, yet secundarily of the Man from Heaven, Ebr. ii. 7, 8. who is the same with the Lord from Heaven, and the quickening Spirit, 1 Cor. xv. 35, 37. who is called the Son, and the second Adam, and Christ in the same Chapter. And it is implied in the particular Concern God was pleased to take upon himself, for producing this living Soul above what he had shewed in producing the Soul it self. So φῶς κατὰ πνοὴν ἀνθρώπου, Prov. xx. 27. Thus we understand the Words of Tatian, who says that the Soul of Man is Darkness. His Meaning was comparatively; as when the Light that is in us is said to be Darkness, S. Matth. vi. 23. S. Luke xi. 35. So this very πνοὴ is Darkness, in comparison with the πνεῦμα as the greater Light, though otherwise it also is φῶς, and φῶς κατὰ, which can hardly be understood of any but that mystical φῶς, which

which is derived from the Λόγος, and whose proper Seat is in the Region of Light, which is opposed to the *Darkness* of this *World*. Thus the *Spirit* of *Man* is said to go upwards, in the forementioned place of *Ecclesiastes*: That is, when it returns to God that gave it, *Eccl.* xii. 7. So *Philo* also explains the difference between this πνοή and πνεῦμα. His Words are very remarkable for clearing the Notions of the *Hellenists*, concerning this Matter. And they are these: Πνοήν γ', ἀλλ' ἢ πνεῦμα εἶρηκεν, ὡς διαφορὰς ἔσσης. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ πνεῦμα νερόηται κατὰ τὴν ἰχὺν καὶ εὐσυνίαν καὶ δύναμιν· ἡ δὲ πνοή ὡς ἂν αὐρά τις ἔσσι καὶ ἀναδυμίασις ἡρεμγία καὶ περραία. Ὁ μὲν ἐν κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα γηγενώς καὶ τὴν ἰδέαν νῆς, πνεύματι δὲ ἂν λέγῃτο κοινοῦναι. Ῥωμὴ γὰρ ἔχει ὁ λογισμὸς αὐτῆς. Ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ὕλης τῆς κρέως καὶ ἐλαφροτέρας ὡς ἂν ἀποφορὰς πνός, ὅποια γίνονται ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρωμάτων. Φυλαττομένων γὰρ ἐδὲν ἥττον καὶ μὴ ἐκδυμωμένων, εὐωδία τις γίνεται. This πνοή is plainly distinguished from the ὁ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα νῆς, as weaker, as *Flesh*, and *Spirit* are usually opposed in *Scripture*, when *weakness* is ascribed to the *Flesh*, and *Strength* to the *Spirit*. That is not all. This πνοή is owned to be *material*, like the *Steams* of odoriferous Bodies. That Consideration alone is sufficient to cut it off from any Pretensions to any proper *natural Immortality*. Yet he makes this to be the νῆς by which

which the *mystical* ἔνωσις is made with the *Divine Spirit*. So before: Τεία γδ' εἴδ' δ' εἰ
 τὸ ἐμπνέον, τὸ δεχόμενον, τὸ ἐμπνεόμενον. Τὸ
 μὴ ἐν ἐμπνέον, ἔστιν ὁ θεός· τὸ δὲ δεχόμενον,
 ὁ νῆς· τὸ δὲ ὑπνέόμενον, τὸ πνεῦμα. Τί ἐν
 οὐκ τέτων συνάγεται; Ἐνωσις γίνεσθαι τῇς τειῶν,
 τέταντ'· τῷ θεῷ ἢ ἀφ' ἑαυτῷ δυνάμιν διὰ τῷ
 μέσῃ πνεύματ'· ἄλλ' τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ. The
 νῆς here mentioned, is afterwards called
 ἀνθρώπιν'· νῆς, which he says, would not
 dare to aspire so high, ὡς ἀντὶ λαβέσθαι θεῷ
 φύσεως, if God himself had not drawn it
 to him, as a *Humane Mind* is capable of
 being drawn. The δεία φύσις is the *Holy Ghost*
 in *S. Peter*. And its drawing the
 same with that mentioned by our Savi-
 our, when he tells us that none can come
 to him except his *Father* draw him, *S.*
John vi. 44. And, that *himself* would
 draw all *Men* after him, xii. 32. And the
 ἀντίληψις the same with the κατ' ἀλήθειαν I
 spoke of before. And the ἔνωσις the *Uni-*
ty of the *Spirit*. Yet this νῆς ἀνθρώπιν',
 which could not *præsume* to *aspire* to this
Divine Commerce, can be no other than
 a *Creature*. However, in *Comparison* of
 the lower unreasonable *Soul*, he owns it
 for a kind of God: ὡσανεὶ γδ' θεός ἐστι τῷ
 ἀλόγῳ ὁ νῆς, which he proves from *Moses's*
 being made a God to *Pharaoh*. Thus there-
 fore *S. Paul's* words are to be understood,
 when, from *Aratus*, he calls us God's off-
 spring.

spring. And our Saviour's, when he applies the Words of the Psalmist, *I have said ye are Gods*, to these $\omega\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma\ \epsilon\varsigma\ \delta\ \Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\ \delta\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma\ \epsilon\gamma\acute{\gamma}\epsilon\tau\omicron$, S. John x. 34, 35. This *lower Spirit* therefore it is that *lusteth* against the *Flesh*, as the *Flesh* lusteth against the *Spirit*. And the *Spirit* that is formed by God in Man, *Zech.* xii. And the $\omega\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \zeta\omega\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ in *Wisd.* xv. 11. where it is mentioned as *distinct* from the *active Soul*. Yet both of them infused by *breathing*. Unless possibly there may be some critical Difference, more than I am yet aware of, between $\epsilon\mu\pi\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ and $\epsilon\mu\phi\upsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu$. Yet $\epsilon\mu\phi\upsilon\sigma\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is ascribed to the $\omega\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ here, which *Philo* ascribes to the $\psi\chi\eta\ \zeta\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha$, and seems to make it signify the same thing with $\epsilon\mu\pi\upsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$. So he: $\tau\omicron\ \gamma\mu\iota\omega\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\phi\upsilon\sigma\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu\ ,\ \acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\gamma\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \epsilon\nu\epsilon\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \eta\ \epsilon\psi\chi\omega\sigma\epsilon\ \tau\alpha\ \acute{\alpha}\psi\chi\alpha$.

I know very well, our *modern Divines* (since the *Aristotelian* Philosophy, as expounded by the *Arabians*, has been received as the *Standard* of the *Philosophical Phænomena* of Divinity) do not allow these two parts of the *Human Soul* to be so *distinct*, as to be *separable*. They rather make them only *distinct Powers* of the same Principle. But you should be pleased to remember that, in this whole Discourse, I make no *modern* Sentiments my *Rule*, any farther, than as they agree with the sense of the *Primitive Church* in the *purest* times. And I know

50.
The Primitive Christians suppose this distinction of the Two Souls in Man, as Fundamental, in their Disputes with their coeval Heretics.

not

not how it can be doubted but *that Church* allowed the *distinction*. This appeared in the Disputes then raised by the *Hareticks*, concerning the *Human Nature* of our Blessed Lord. Especially the *Arians* and *Apollinarists*. The one of them thought the *Divinity* supplied the Office of even the *Human Soul*. The others granted him to have a *Soul* consubstantial to ours ; but pretended however, that the *Divinity* supplied, at least, the Office of the *Human λόγος*, or *Nēs*. Nor do the *Catholicks*, in their Disputes against them *both*, deny the *distinction*, but assert each of them to *him*, as *essential* to the true *Human Nature*, without each of which he could not have been *Homoousial* to us, as to his *Human Nature*, as he was to his *Father*, in regard of his *Divinity*, according to the determination of the Council of *Chalcedon*. Particularly, the most learned and judicious Bishop *Pearson* thinks that the Assertion of the *Soul* of our Lord, against the *Apollinarists*, was the true reason why the Article of the *Descent* into *Hell*, was inserted into the *then* received *Creeds*. And indeed with great probability. Which shews that the Church *then* took it for *more* than a *disputable* Opinion. Such they did not insert in *Creeds*, but only such *Doctrines* which *themselves*, at least, believed *Fundamental*. But *both* these *parts* of the *Soul* were supposed in this Article of the

the
me
pre
it
as
the
cep
the
So
th
ex
ca
w
ca
vi
T
c
c

the descent into Hell. For it could not be meant of his Divinity, (which being *omnipresent*) neither can ascend nor descend. And it was his Soul which the Psalmist foretold as not left in Hell. And Ἅδης is the Hell there spoken of, which is the common receptacle of Souls, both good and bad, in the state of separation. But the Choical Soul, could not survive the Body without the breath of Life, which preserves it from *extinguishing*, when the Body is made incapable of being acted by it. Its Union with the *ὦς πνεῦμα* is that alone which can then continue its Being, so long as the *ὦς* or *πνεῦμα* continues in its own Being. This therefore alone makes it capable of coming into Ἅδης, which is a state, not of Non-existence, but of *Invisibilty* only. The Gnosticks therefore, in S. Irenæus, who believed these Two Souls, not only separable, but actually separated; accordingly thought there were Choical Men who had the lower Soul without the *πνοὴ ζωῆς*, who had no portion in the separate State, as perishing together with the Body; and that the Psychical Men, who had the *Νῆς*, as well as the *ψυχή*, could pretend no higher than the *Status Medietatis*, being excluded from the *Pleroma*, the Seat of those Beings which were properly Immortal. So S. Athanasius, against the Apollinarists, proves it necessary that

that our *Saviour* should assume the *upper* as well as the *lower* Soul, if he designed a *compleat* Salvation of our *whole Man*. Thus therefore it plainly appears, that in the *Opinions* of those *Times*, these *Two Souls* were distinguished from each other; and much more from the *Divine Spirit* received in *Baptism*, which was the Principle of proper *Immortality*. As much as the *Divinity* of our *Saviour* was distinguished from these *two lower* degrees derived from *Adam* as he was a *living Soul*. For the *Baptismal Spirit*, makes us *Partakers of the Divine Nature*, as far as we are capable of being so. Because the *Divine Spirit*, the *Third Person* in the *Trinity*, is the *Spirit of Christ*, in whose *Humanity* the *Fulness* of that *Spirit* is said to dwell, being *anointed* with this *Oil of Gladness* above his *Brethren*. Of this *Fulness* all *Members* of his are said to *receive*, and *Grace for Grace*. That is, so as that none has *all* as *he* has, and none has *any* but what he *receives* from *him*, and that each *Individual* Member has some wherein he *resembles* him, so far, at least, as to what he has *received* from *him*. This makes us *one Spirit*, as well as the *Water-Baptism* makes us *one Body* with him, which is the *chief*, and most *beneficial* *Mystical Union* with *Him*.

The *Archetypal Ideal Man*, the $\delta \kappa \alpha \tau' \epsilon \iota \kappa \eta \nu \alpha$, the *Man from Heaven*, to whom the *Dominion* over the *Creatures* is ascribed, and which is truly the *immortalizing Principle*, is ascrib'd to our *Saviour*, in *1 Cor. xv.* and *Heb. ii.* Perfectly agreeable to the *Platonists*, who thought all the *Idea*, and therefore the $\alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omicron$ among the rest, to be in the $\Lambda \delta \gamma \omicron \varsigma$. This seems indeed to be the same with the *Divine Spirit*, the *Third Person* of the *Trinity*, as it is in the *disposal* of our *Lord*, as the *Spirit of Christ*. And with this *Adam* had been united if he had not fallen. And this was *God's designing* him to be *Immortal*, that *God* was pleased, by his good use of the $\pi \nu \omicron \eta$, to put this *Union* with that $\pi \nu \epsilon \upsilon \mu \alpha$ in his *Power*, by which he intended to *immortalize* him. But that was *lost* by the *Fall*, and it was the *design* of the *Incarnation* to *restore* it by our *Christian Baptism*. Yet it is not so *completely* lost, but that we still retain some *glimmerings* of even that *Divine Light* in our *rational Souls*, as far as a *mortal Creature* is capable of retaining it. So *Tatian* concerning the *fallen Soul*; $\tau \omicron \delta \epsilon \pi \nu \epsilon \upsilon \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \upsilon \tau \eta \nu \epsilon \pi \epsilon \delta \alpha \iota \mu \eta \beta \upsilon \lambda \omicron \mu \delta \eta \nu \alpha \upsilon \tau \omega \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \epsilon \lambda \omicron \iota \pi \epsilon \nu$. $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \nu \alpha \upsilon \sigma \mu \alpha \tau \delta \delta \upsilon \nu \alpha \mu \epsilon \omega \varsigma \alpha \upsilon \tau \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \kappa \tau \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \eta$, $\kappa \upsilon \delta \iota \alpha \tau \delta \chi \omega \rho \iota \sigma \mu \omicron \nu \tau \alpha \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \alpha \kappa \alpha \delta \omicron \rho \epsilon \alpha \nu \mu \eta \delta \upsilon \nu \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu \eta$, &c. This $\epsilon \nu \alpha \upsilon \sigma \mu \alpha$ is the $\phi \omega \varsigma \kappa \upsilon \rho \iota \epsilon$, in the *Proverbs*. And *Tatian* himself ascribes an *affinity* to it with the

51.
They also
suppose the
Reasonable
Soul
it self, to
be a deri-
vation
from
Christ, as
the $\Lambda \delta \gamma \omicron \varsigma$

The Distinction between

Spirit which has deserted it. So he tells us concerning *good Souls*; αἱ μὲν πειθόμεναι σοφίᾳ, σοφίᾳ αὐταῖς ἐφείληγον το πνεῦμα συγγενές. And *S. Paul* seconds him in it, when he owns even *Gentile Souls* (who had *lost* the πνεῦμα by *Adam's Fall*, and had *not* recovered it by our *Saviour's Baptism*) to be of the γένος of *God*. This could be meant of nothing but the πνοή, the *Rational Soul*, as I have already observed. *Reason* therefore is taken for *Divine*, and as sufficient to entitle to the name of *God* in the *lower* sense, as I have already shewn, from *Philo* and our *Saviour* himself. But I should, not so much regard *Tatian* in this matter if he had not the *Suffrages* of better *Authorities*. His Master *S. Justin* owns an ἐμφυτον παντὶ γένει ἀνθρώπων σπέρμα τῷ λόγῳ. *Semen* is frequently used in this sense by the *Gnosticks*, in *Irenæus*, for this *immortal Principle* of the *Spirit*, derived from their *Æons* and *Pleroma*. And by *S. John* himself 1 *Ep.* iii. 9. where the phrases of having the *Seed*, and being *born of God*, are used *Synonymously*. And *S. Justin* there opposes this σπέρματικὸς λόγος to the λόγος τῷ παντός, which he says is *Christ*. This therefore can be no other than the ἐναυσμα of his Disciple *Tatian*. In his second *Apology* (which is really the *former* in time) he is more *express*. He there calls our *Blessed Lord* πρωτότοκον τῷ θεῷ, and λόγον, ὃ πάντων γένος.

Apolog. i.
p. 46.

ib. ii. p. 83.

ἀν-

ἀνθρώπων μετέχε. And then subjoyns : καὶ ὁ μετὰ λόγῳ βιώσαντες, χειρισαντοί εἰσι, καὶ ἄλλοι ἐνομίθησαν οἷον ἐν Ἑλλήσι μὲν Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡράκλειτος, καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς, &c. He had mentioned *Heraclitus* in his *other* Apology with reference to this place, ὡς προέφημυ· which, by the way, is another Argument, that the second was truly the *former* in order of *time*. His examples are of *Heathens*, who could have no other *Communication* with *Christ*, but by this *supreme* part of their *Rational Souls*. Yet this he thinks sufficient to entitle them to the name of *Christians*, for *living* by that λόγος which was derived from the Ἀυτολόγος, that I may speak in the Language of the *Platonists*. And he repeats it again afterwards: Οἱ δὲ μετὰ λόγῳ βιώσαντες, καὶ βιωῦντες, χειρισαντοί. The *affinity* of the λόγος in our *Souls*, and the *Fontal* λόγος, and the natural dependence on it as a λόγος, and the small and obscure *remainder* of the *Image of God*, which was *lost* by the *fall* of *Mankind*, will give an *easie* and *clear* account of these things (according to the *Platonick Hypothesis*) which have been so censured as trifling, sporting upon *words*, by Persons, otherwise very *learned*, but not so particularly *versed* in that *Philosophy* so frequently alluded to in the *Scriptures*, as well as the *earliest Fathers*.

52. But for the clearer explication of the difference between the Spirit in us, as the our, *as* Supreme constituent of our Human Nature, Christ, *was anointed in his* and the Divine Spirit which we receive from Christ, as the Principle that raises and Human Nature, *ennobles and immortalizes us*; it will not be by the ful- amiss to observe that the Spirit which over- nesses of the shadowed the Blessed Virgin at our Saviour's Divine Incarnation was the Third, not the Second, Spirit. Person of the Trinity. Our Creed obliges And, on that ac- us to own this, which professes that our count, as Lord was conceived by the Holy Ghost. Thence well as the Blessed Virgin is said to be that of the *κεχαριτω-* Αὐτοῦ, *be μέν,* in being overshadowed by it, which is gained a Right of it self the *χαρις*, and the Original of all being sty- the *χαριτες* and *χαρισματα* that are distri- led the buted among Men. Thence our Blessed Son of God. Lord himself has the title of Christ or Mes- sias, from this Archetypical Unction, which cannot agree to his Divine, but his Humane, Nature. His Divine Nature neither needs, nor is capable of, any farther Sanctification. But it is his Human Nature, that is anoint- ed with the oil of gladness above his fellows. It is this, in which it has pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell. That is the Fulness of the Spirit, as opposed to the Grace for Grace by us received from him. It is in this that the Fulness of the Godhead is said to dwell bodily. Not as if it self had any thing of a Body, but in opposition to the shadows of the Law, mentioned in the Epistle to

to the *Hebrews*. So that the meaning is, that the *Divine Spirit* it self dwelt in our *Saviour*, not only by a *Visible Symbol* of the *Spirit*, such as were in the *Schechinahs* that overshadowed the *Mercy seat*, or the *Clouds* of the *Tabernacle*, or the *Temple*, in the time of the *Law*. The Word therefore implies the *Original Spirit*, the *αὐτοχρημα* (to use the Phrase of the *Platonists*) in opposition to *sensible Representations* of it. Yet this *Spirit* is the ground why our *Saviour* is called the *Son of God*. So the *Evangelists* expressly : *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee : Therefore also that holy thing, which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God*, S. *Luke* i. 35. This cannot be understood of the *Filiation* of the *Λόγος*, which is *eternal*. It must therefore be understood of another, that is only *temporary* ; that is, of the *Man Christ Jesus*, as he is elsewhere called. Whereby the *Man* is the *Son of God*, and whereby *he* is the *first born* among many *Brethren* ; that is, among many other *Men* who are *Sons of God* as well as *he*. They could not otherwise be called his *Brethren*. Nor is he called a *Son* on account of the *Miraculous* and *Extraordinary* manner of his *Humane Generation*, as the *Socinians* would have it, who are, by no means competent *Judges* of these matters, whilst they neglect *coeval Authors* for the signification of *terms*

The Distinction between

of *Art.* God is the God of the *Spirits* of all *Flesh*, *Numb.* xvi. 22. This makes all who partake of the *Spirit* of *Christ*, to have one God with him, as our Saviour himself speaks. And in this regard, the *Father* is the God as well as the *Father* of our Lord. And he is the *Father* of *Lights*, *S. Jam.* i. 17. Of this particularly which we receive in *Baptism*, from whence our Saviour's *Baptism* is itself called *Illumination*. This makes his *Father* our *Father* also. So *Homer* calls the *Supreme Being* $\omega\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\epsilon\alpha\ \alpha\nu\delta\rho\omega\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\ \pi\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\omega\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\epsilon$. And *Kings* particularly he calls $\Delta\iota\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, as having the *Divine* Extraction on account of the *Spirit* of *Government*. *Virgil* indeed scruples it concerning *Man*. His appellation is, *Divûm pater, atq; hominum Rex*. Wherein he imitated his *Roman* Predecessor *Ennius*. But concerning the *Gods*, the *Greek* and the *Latin* Poets agree. So he is *Pater optimus Divûm*, in *Lucilius*, and *Magnus Pater Divûm* in *Persius*, and *Reſtorq; Paterq;* in *Ovid*, *Metam.* ix. which would have oblig'd them to allow the same form of Speech for such *Men* also, as they had believed to have been Partakers of the *Divine Nature*, which is the case of the whole *new Peculium*. But it cuts off all pretences to God as a *Father*, from those *Men* who have no more than the *essential* Ingredients of the *Humane Nature*, which is the highest claim of the rest of *Mankind*. That glim-
mering

mering light that still remains in the Soul since the *Fall*, is not alone sufficient for it: It is *preternatural*, and *supernatural*. And it is not so *fixt*, as to continue the Soul in its Being beyond the *Resurrection*, or at least, the *Conflagration*, which is to follow the day of *Judgment*.

This Divine Spirit is, as I said, called a *Seed*, not only in the *Philosophical* Traditions of the *Gnosticks*, but also in the *Scripture*. And it is the *Seed* of the *Father*, from whom it is said ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς S. *John* xv. 26. A word very properly applicable to *Seed*, it must therefore entitle them who have it to the *first* Person in the *Trinity* as their *Father*, not the *second*. And the *Human Nature*, deriving its *Divine Extraction* from the same *Spirit*, could therefore give the *Divine Person*, on that account, no higher a Relation to the *Members* of the *Peculium* than that of a *Brother*. If ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς have relation to the notion of a *Seed*, it will determine the Question concerning the ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ of the *Holy Ghost* from the *Son*, in favour of the *Greeks*. For none pretends that the *Holy Ghost* did, in this sense, proceed from the *Son*, so as to make the *Son* his *Father*. Περὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ is the word generally used by the *Gnosticks* in *Irenæus*, which the *Latin* Interpreter renders *emittere*, when they speak of the *Active* production of their *Æons*, to which ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς

53.
That same Spirit being the Seed of the Father, but derived to us by our Saviour will make us the Sons of God, and Brethren of our Saviour.

The Distinction between

would answer conveniently enough, on the part of the Being so produced. But this only by the way. However it is certain that our *Filiation* is derived from our *Participation* of this *Divine Spirit*. This is the *Spirit of Adoption*, by which we are qualified to cry *Abba Father*. This is the *Divine Nature* mention'd by S. Peter. This is the *Image of him who is the Image of the invisible God*. As *Adam* is said to be made after *God's Image*, and to beget a *Son after his own Image*. This is the *Spirit* which we receive in our *Christian Baptism*, which is the *Laver of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost*; wherein we are *born again*, not of *Water* only, but also of the *Spirit*; wherein we are *born, not of Blood, nor of the will of the Flesh, nor of the will of Man, but of God*; wherein we receive power to be called *Sons of God*; wherein we have that *Spirit renewed in us*, which we lost by *Adam*: which is the new *ἡλικία* restoring the old *ἡλικία* with which *Adam* was created. Thus therefore by this *Participation* of the *Spirit of Christ*, we became related to his *Humanity*, as anointed with this *Oyl of gladness* above his *Fellows*. And as he is the *Λόγος* also. So the *Platonists* took him for the *Treasury* of all the *Ideæ*, and among others, of that of all the *Archetypal Man*, the *ὑποαὐθροπὸς* or *ἀνθροπὸς ἐσιωδὸς*.
And

And the καρὴν of Νῆς was lodged in the *Sun*, the *Archetypical Intellectual Sun*, which was the same with them as the *Divine Λόγος*. So the πνεῦμα is the same with *Christ*, and the *Lord from Heaven*, in the *Reasonings* of *S. Paul*. And their *Names* are used promiscuously. The *Seed* of the *Spirit* is called the *incorruptible Seed of the word of God*, which lives and abides for ever, 1 S. Pet. i. 23. and the *word of God which is in us*, 1 S. Job. i. 10. and which *abides in us*, 1 S. Job. ii. 14. And *Christ in us*, the *hope of glory*, Col. i. 17. By this we understand the occasion of the mistake of several of the earliest *Latin Fathers* especially, who *confounded* these *two* Titles of our Saviour to the Appellation of *God*; the one, that of his *Person*, as *Λόγος*, and the *second Person* of the *Trinity*: the other, as even his *Humane Nature* was *consecrated* by the *Fulness* of the *Divine Spirit*, the *third Person* of the same *Trinity*; which is a *Divine Nature* in the *highest* sense, and entitled him to the name of *God* in the *same* sense, as possessing it in its *Fulness*, as the *Fountain* of it; not only in its *derivative* Gifts and Graces, which was sufficient for the name of a *God* in the *lower* and *popular* Sense then received.

This term of *Abiding*, seems to have been chosen by the *Holy Ghost* to express
 54.
 The Spirit's abiding in us
 is a Prerogative of the Gospel. What is meant by that form of Speech.
 the

the *peculiar* way of the *Spirit's* residing in *us* above that which the *Antients*, who lived before the Incarnation, could pretend to. So it is observed concerning the *Descent* of the *Holy Ghost* upon our *Saviour* himself, at his *Baptism*, by *S. John the Baptist*; ἐμείνεν ἐπ' αὐτόν, *S. John* i. 32. μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν, v. 33. And *S. Mark* i. 10. in the *vulgar*. So the *Father* is said μένειν in the *Son*, *S. John* xiv. 10. And the *Holy Ghost*, the *Paraclete*, μένειν with *us*, and in *us*, and that for ever, v. 16, 17. And the *Father* and the *Son* are said μὸνὴν ποιεῖν with *us*, v. 23. And the *Seed* of *God* is said μένειν in *him*, who is *begotten* of *God*, 1 *S. John* iii. 9. which *Seed* is the *Spirit* of *Adoption*, by which we are made *Sons*, and enabled to cry *Abba Father*. The same Expression is used concerning *God the Father* singly, 1 *S. John* iv. 12, 15, 16. And concerning the *Son* also. Which yet is known by his *Spirit*; ἐν τέτρω γνώσκομεν ὅτι μένει ἐν ἡμῖν, ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος ἃ ἡμῖν ἔδωκεν, 1 *S. John* iii. 24. Thus we see that this Expression is used concerning all the three *Persons* of the *Trinity*, as far as they are pleased to admit *us* to the *mystical* ἔνωσις and κοινωνία with themselves, which is the *peculiar Prerogative* of the *Gospel-Dispensation*, and the *new Peculium*. And it certainly signifies much more than any Expression used concerning the *Influence* of the

the *Holy Spirit* on the *antient* Prophets before the *Resurrection*, which is the *Epocha* of giving the *Spirit* by the Doctrine of the *New Testament*. Even then the *Spirit* is said to have *come* upon them, to have *fallen* upon them, to have *rushed* upon them, and that *mightily*. But its *abiding* on any, seems to have been reserved for our *Saviour's Triumph*, as a singular Recommendation of his *munificence* on this Occasion. What then can be meant by its *abiding* in *us*? Certainly a more *lasting* Possession of *us*, than was imported by any of *those* Expressions used concerning the *Inspirations* mentioned in the *Old Testament*. And indeed their *Inspirations* were very short of *ours* under the *Gospel* in *this* particular also. *Balaam* had true *Inspirations*, who neither was of the *chosen People*, nor a *good* and *well* disposed *Man*, fit for receiving the *Prophetick Spirit*. So also *Saul*, though of the *true Peculium*, yet after the *Spirit* of *God* had *departed* from him, and after he was *abandoned* by *God*, and exposed to the *Insults* of an *Evil Spirit*, then certainly *unworthy* of the *good Spirit*. Yet *he* also *prophesied* when, in pursuit of *David*, he came among the *Prophets*, under the Presidency of *Samuel*. Neither of these *Motions* could have been any more than what the *schoolmen* call *Prophetick Instincts*, which required no *Purity* of the *Recipients*, but might,

as

as *God* saw good, have been communicated to very *wicked* Persons. These were confessedly *Prophets*, no otherwise than *occasionally*. But there were also *true Prophets*, who cannot be thought *inspired* with the *Prophetick Spirit constantly*. Such was the *old lying Prophet*, who deceived the *true Prophet*, who was sent to denounce *Judgment* against the *Altar* erected by *Jeroboam*. Yet even *he* was made use of for *denouncing* Judgment against the *better Prophet*, who had been *deluded* by him on a *false Pretence* of a *Divine Inspiration*. Such were all the *true Prophets* of *Ahab's Kingdom of Israel*, excepting *Micaiah*, when *God* permitted them *all* to be themselves *deceived* by a *lying Spirit*. Nor could *any* of them all *prophecie* when *themselves* pleased. The *High-Priest* himself could not pretend to it, without his *Oracle of Urim*, or the *Water of Jealousie*, or such other *instituted Means* for *receiving* the Influences of the *Spirit*. Nor could *any* of the *Prophets* exercise it, but as they were *stirred up* by the *Spirit* it self. Accordingly these *extraordinary Afflations* were either *given*, or *denied*, as *God* was *pleased* to favour or punish the *Publick*, for whose *Use* these *Gifts* of the *Spirit* were designed, which were given *then*. Therefore *Saul* could have no *Responses* at all by *any* of the *Means* then allowed for giving *Divine Oracles*. No,

not

not even in the Case of *Jonathan*, when he had ignorantly incurred his Father's *Imprecation*. And the *failing* of the *Prophetick Spirit*, is taken for one of the most disconsolating Circumstances of the Condition of the *old Peculium*, after their *return* from the *Babylonish Captivity*. Nor could any *Personal Piety* secure the *Continuance* of those *Gifts* of the *Spirit* then, which were *not* given as the *Rewards* of *Personal Piety*, but for the use of *others*, rather than of the *Persons* who were *favoured* with them. Even the *Spirit of Prayer* and *Supplication* then mentioned, was an *Excitation* to *Prayers* for their *temporal Deliverances* from *Publick Calamities*. It was a *Token* that *God* would bear such *Prayers* for the *Publick*, when he was pleased, by his *Spirit*, to raise a *zealous* and *ardent* Concern for the *publick*, in *Persons* eminently *Pious*, which might vent it self in *Prayers* for the *Publick*; though *otherwise* the Case might sometimes fall out, that even *fervent Prayers* might not be available for the removal of *temporal Calamities* from the *common Body*. But the *abiding* of the *Spirit* in us, which is *proper* to the *Gospel*, relates to the *Good* of the *Soul* of him who is so happy as to be *entitled* to it, and depends not on the *Behaviour* of *others*, if he, who has it, be not *wanting* to *himself* in qualifying himself for its *Continuance*. And therefore it is as *lasting* as the *Person*

Person is true to the *Disposition* required on his part, which the *Scripture* calls *abiding in God and Christ*, and in the *Truth*, and in the *Unity of the Spirit*, in order to the securing the *Benefits* of the *Cœlestial Mystical Communion*. This is that which the *Old Testament* never pretends as a *Benefit* of that *old Dispensation*. But where-ever it speaks of it, it is only by way of *Prediction*, of what should be performed in the *latter Days*, by which it always understands the times of the *Gospel*, according to the *Interpretation* of the *Apostles*, and the other *Writers* of the *New Testament*. *Méven* therefore implies such an *abiding of the Spirit in us*, as agrees to an *Inhabitant*, not to a *Stranger* or a *Traveller*, who designs no long *stay*. So the *Disciples* meant in their question to our *Saviour*, Πᾶ μένεις; *Where dwellest thou?* They desired to know the place of his *fixt* abode, *S. John* i. 39. So the μένεις παύλεις, *Ebr.* xiii. 14. is opposed to the *uncertainty* of the *abode* of *Strangers* and *Pilgrims*. Such as that was of the *Israelites* in their passage from *Egypt* to *Canaan*. And such as *we* are all supposed to be in while we are in *this World*, our *Mystical Egypt*, where we are *Sojourners* in our way to the *Mystical Canaan*, our *Heavenly Countrey*. So the *Son of Sirach* makes *Wisdom*, after her *Travels* through all *Nations*, to *fix* her *Habitation* in *Israel*, *Eccl.* xxiv. 13. But this seems only

ly to have related to her *Government* of that *Nation* as a *Theocracy*, not to her *dwelling* in their *Persons*, and qualifying them for *supernatural* Benefits. The *Hellenists* then seem to have had no *Notion* of the *Inhabitation* of the Spirit in us, as in *Temples*. And the *Apostolical Writers* refer the Passages of the *Old Testament* Prophecies, which intimate it, to the State of the *Gospel*. So *S. Paul*, 2 *Cor.* vi. 16. So also his *Colleague Apostle* of the Gentiles, *Barnabas* in his *Catholick Epistle*, c. 16. Yet *Seneca*, Ep. 41. and *Hierocles* on the *Golden Verses*, mention the like *Habitation* of a *Divine Spirit* in *Men*, as attainable by *Philosophy*, which *Clemens Alexandrinus* also mentions, and allows it. This was singular and proper to the *new Peculium*. But much more so, that every particular *Christian* should thus receive the Spirit by the same *Baptism*, that initiated him into the *Privileges* of the *Christian Society*. That all should thus be now taught of *God* immediately; by the *God* that made him his *Temple*, by the *Unction*, from whence he received the *Name* of *Christian*, a Derivation from that which gave our *Lord* the Title of *Christ* or *Messias*, on which account we are not only *Christians*, but *anointed*, or *Christs*, in the Language of the *Psalmist*. It is therefore a *fixt Habitation* of the Spirit, that is signified by this Word *μείνω*, or *abiding*, in the *New Testament* ;

ment ; not *single* and *occasional* Inflations of it, such as those were, which were, for some time, *common* under the *old* Dispensation. Not only so : The same *Word*, as it is used in *Scripture*, signifies an *Eternal Abode*, and is therefore very proper for denoting a *Principle* of *Immortality*. So the words *for ever*, are frequently joined with it, Ps. xxxiii. 11. lxxxix. 36. cxi. 3. 10. cxii. 3. 9. cxvii. 2. Is. xl. 8. S. *John* xii. 34. Ebr. vii. 3. 24. And, even when those *Words* are not added, yet the *Word* μένει implies them. So the κρείττων ὑπαρξίς ἐρανοῖς καὶ μένουσα, Ebr. x. 30. And the μένουσα πόλις ἢ μέλλουσα, Ebr. xiii. 14. Both places speak of the *Cœlestial* Archetypes, which are always, in this *Platonical* Reasoning of the *New Testament*, supposed *Eternal*. So the βρώσις μένουσα εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, S. *John* vi. 27. It seems opposed to the *Word* παράγειν used concerning the *Enjoyments* of *this World*, to shew how *uncertain* they are and *transitory*. So, παράγει τὸ σῆμα τὸ σῶμα τέτε, I Cor. vii. 31. Ἡ σαρξία παράγεται, I S. *John* ii. 8. Ὁ σῶμα παράγεται, v. 17. Yet even the *Words* εἰς αἰῶνα are added on this very *Occasion* of speaking of the *Spirit*. Our *Saviour* promises to pray the *Father* to give the *Spirit*, ἵνα μὲν μετ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ αἰῶνα, S. *Joh.* xiv. 16. And we are said to be *born again*, not of *corruptible* seed, but of *incorruptible*, διὰ λόγου ζωῆς καὶ μένοντος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, I S. *Pet.*

1 S. Pet. i. 23. This *Seed*, by which we are *born again*, is no other than the *Baptismal Spirit*. This is the *Seed* which *abides* in us, 1 S. John iii. 9. And the *Life* to which we are here *begotten*, is called a ζῶν αἰώνιος ἐν αὐτῷ μένον, 1 S. John iii. 15. And the *Sonship* to which this *Spirit of Adoption* entitles us, gives us a *Right* to *abide*, μένειν, in *God's House*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, S. John viii. 35. And the same form of *Speech* is made use of concerning the *Punishment* of the *Breach* of our *Baptismal Covenant*: Ἡ ὁρμή τοῦ θεοῦ μένει ἐπ' αὐτόν, S. John iii. 36. Ἡ ἀμάρτια ὑμῶν μένει, ix. 41. Where *Sin* is taken for the *Punishment* of *Sin*, as when it is said, *your Iniquity shall find you out*. So μένει ἐν θανάτῳ, 1 S. John iii. 14. by which we may easily gather, that this is to be *Eternal* also: So that *both States* are *immortalized* by this *Divine Spirit*, which had not been so without it.

Indeed its entitling us to *Heaven*, sufficiently shews it to be a *distinct Principle* from our *Human Souls*; even from that *part* of them which was from the *Divine Breath*. The place for *separate Souls*, is the *Air*, not *Heaven*, any otherwise than as the *Air* has the Name of *Heaven* also, and as the *Heaven* of the *Blessed* is called the *Heaven of Heavens*, by way of *Contradistinction* from this *lower Heaven*. That is really "Adēs the *Receptacle* of good, as

55.

The same Distinction appears in this, that the Air is the proper Abode for separate Souls; but Heaven is the proper Abode of the Spirit.

R

well

well as *wicked Souls*, till the *Resurrection*, according to the *Antients*. So *Origen* understood the Passage of *S. John*; *The sea gave up the dead which were in it: and death and hell delivered up the dead that were in them*, *Rev. xx. 13.* *Ut ego puto, mare hic pro humido omni appellatum est elemento, infernus autem pro aere, mors verò pro terrâ.* His Words are from *Pamphilus* the Martyr, in his *Apology* for him, out of his Work *de Resurrectione*. The Word used by the Sacred Writers for *Hell*, or *Infernus*, is *ᾍδης*, and it agrees very well with his Design, that when the *Grave*, which is meant by *Death*, gave up the *Bodies* as well as the *Sea*, *ᾍδης* also should give up the *Souls* there deposited, in order to their *Re-union* at the *Resurrection*. This is paraphrased by the Apocryphal *Esdra*s, in these Words: *The Earth shall restore those that are asleep in her, and so shall the Dust those that dwell in silence, and the secret Places shall deliver those Souls that were committed unto them*, *2 Esd. vii. 32.* This Author might have had this place of the *Revelations* in view when he wrote this, as he seems to have had several other Passages of that same mysterious Book in other places. And he lived in so near Memory of *S. John*, that he might very well know how the *Christians* of that Age understood him, for whose use the *Holy Ghost* designed it. He is certainly

ly not only elder than S. Ambrose, who quotes this very Passage from him, *de Bon. Mort. c. 10.* than Origen himself, who very probably took what he has here from him; but than even Origen's Master, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who quotes this Book, though not this Passage. *Promptuaria* is the Word in our present Translation, but in S. Ambrose it is *Habitacula*; perhaps οἰκητήρια in the Greek, as will appear hereafter. *Habitaculum* is the Term used by the antient Author, *de tribus habitaculis*, by whom it appears to have been in the middle, between Heaven and Hell, and distinct from both of them. Like the Gnostick *status medietatis*, distinct from the *Pleroma*, as well as this lower World, and by them allotted for such Souls, as were not of the spiritual Seed. So strange an Agreement there is among all the Primitive Christians, Hereticks as well as Catholicks, in this Matter. The Fathers are so agreed in it, that our most learned Bishop Pearson has expounded the Article of the Descent into Hell, of the Descent of our Saviour's Soul into this common Custody of Souls, as Lactantius calls it, that his Death might be every way like ours; that his Soul might, upon its Dissolution from the Body, go to the common Receptacle of Souls, as his Body did to the Grave, which is to receive all our Bodies. That was a Point which was then believed of greater Consequence,

quence, than we may think it now. The Scandal of the *Cross* made the *Hereticks* of those times generally, as well as the *Gentile Infidels*, unwilling to believe that the *Supreme Being* could condescend so far as to *die like us*. However, that this is the place for *separate Souls*, and that *none*, or very few of them, go to the places of their *ultimate Reward or Punishment*, till the day of *Judgment*, the *first Antients* were generally agreed, and the *Greeks* to this very day, and many *late*, as well as *great*, Authorities even among the *Latines* themselves. Such were *S. Bernard*, and Pope *John XXII*. Such, even of the *Romish Communion*, *Mr. White*, *de medio Animarum statu*, to name no more. And, in our own Church, my great and honoured Patron, *Bishop Taylor*, and the very learned and judicious *Mr. Thorndike*. And that this *middle space* is *Ἄδης*, appears from *Homer*, the *first Author* of that λέξις that we know of. He places *Tartarus*, ἰλ——δ'.

Τόσων ἐνερδ' αἶδω ὅσον ἔρανος ἐς' ἀπὶ
γαίης.

He plainly divides the *Subcaelestial World* into *two Spaces*: The one from *Heaven* to our *Earth*, which he calls *Ἄδης*; the other from the *Earth downwards*, which was his *Tartarus*. So *Hesiod* understood him, when

when he repeated his Words : Only with this Difference ; that instead of ἐνερθ' αἰθέρω, he thought fitter to express it ἐνερθ' ὑπο γῆς, by which it appears more plainly, that he took our *Earth* for the *lowest* Bound of *Adns*. So *Lucretius*, L. IV. also ;

*Despectum præbet sub terras impete tanto,
A terris quantum, cæli patet altus hiatus.*

He there alludes to *Homer's* Words, tho' he does not use them concerning the same thing. Yet his *Allusion* to the Words is sufficient for my Purpose, to shew that the *Earth* was taken for the *Bound* of *Homer's* *Adns*. So *Virgil* also, *Aeneid* VI.

*Tum Tartarus ipse
Bis patet in præceps, tantum tenditque sub
umbras,
Quantus ad æthereum, cæli suspectus Olym-
pum.*

The Phrase, *ire sub umbras* with him, answers that of *Homer*, αἰδ' ὁ δὲ βελήκει. By which it appears, that *Adns* is the same with *him* as the place of the *umbræ*, by which he means the *separate Souls*, as invested with those *subtil Bodies*, which gave them a *Shape*, and a Capacity of appearing to our *Senses*, and of suffering *Corporeal Impressions*, according to the

MSOxon.
Seld. olim.
Chr. Lon-
goli. p.
153.

Antients. These are *Homer's* ψυχῶν εἰδωλὰ θανόντων. This therefore can be no other than the *Air*. Accordingly *Vettius Valens Antiochenus* makes that the place of *separate Souls*, and proves it by the *Testimony* of the *Orphick* and other *Oracles*, which were of great *Authority* with the *Philosophers* of these *lower Ages*.

His words are these, Πελαγοδρομήσας ἔν, ὁ MS. καὶ πολλὰ γλῶθ διοδύσας, κλιμάτων τε καὶ ἔδνων κατόπτης γινόμενος πολυχρονία πείρα καὶ πόνοις συνεμπερὴς ἡξιώθην ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν καὶ τῆς περὶ νότιας βεβαίας καὶ ἀσφαλῆς λιμένος τυχεῖν. Οὐ γὰρ φθαρτὰ πάντα καὶ μολαῖα ἔλαχον οἱ ἄνθρωποι. Ἔστι δὲ τι καὶ δεῖον ὅν ἡμῖν δεόπνευστον δημῆργημα. Ὅγε περιεχυμένον ἄνθρωπον MS. ἀφθάρσει ὑπάρχων καὶ διήκων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀπύρροισαν καίρικλιν ἀθανασίαν ἀπονέμει τακτῶ καὶ μετρημένῳ χρόνῳ. ὡς ἔφαθ' ἡμῶν κατ' ἡμέραν μελεῖσθαι γυμναζόμενος λαμβάνειν, ἢ καὶ ἀποδιδόναι τὸ ζωτικὸν πνεῦμα, καὶ οὕτως καὶ ὁ θεὸς ταῖς Ὀρφεὺς λέγει.

ἡ MS. Ψυχὴ δ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἐρρίζωται.
Καὶ ἄλλως.

μετα MS. Ἄερα δ' ἔλκοντες ψυχὰς θεῖαν δρεπόμεθα.
Ἄλλως.

Ψυχὴ δ' ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρωσ ἐκ Διὸς ἐστίν.
Ἄλλως.

Ψυχὴ δ' ἀθάνατος πάντων, τὰ δ' σώματα θνητά.

Ἐν-

"Ενθεν ἐφ' ὅσον ἔχοντι τὴν ψυχὴν κινέμεθα,
 καὶ ὁμιλοῦμεν, καὶ παύομεν, καὶ μηχανώμεθα,
 καὶ ποιοῦμεν, ἔργα ἰσόδεα. Ὅποτε δ' εἰς τὴν
 αἴερα ἀναδραμῇ τὸ χρέος· παύεται σῶμα
 νεκρὸν ἀναυδόν, κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἑτέραν τὸ πνεύ-
 μα [μὴ I think should be added for the
 sense] συγκεχωρηκός, κενὸν εἰμαρμένης, [in
 opposition to the θεῖον δημιουργημα θεό-
 πιδον, when it had the Spirit from the
 Air,] δημιουργημα· [add θεῶν alluding to the
 ἔργα ἰσόδεα before mentioned,] ἐδενός ὃν
 δεκτικόν. Τῆς γὰρ φύσεως [why not rather
 πνεύσεως or φύσεως?] ἀναλυθείσης εἰς τὴν
 οἰκίον τόπον ἐλέγχεται τότε τὸ θεῖον σῶμα.
 The Author is not extant, nor is the
 MS. common. Both will recommend the
 giving his words to the curious Reader.
 His beginning is plainly an imitation of
 Critodemus, one of the antientest Writers
 of Judicial Astrology. That Author's words
 Vettius Valens has preserved as follows:
 Ὁ δὲ σοφώτατος Κεῖλόςδημος ἐν τῇ ἐπιγραφα-
 μνῇ αὐτοῦ Ὁρασις συνεκτικωτάτη πλῶν μαρ-
 τυρίων ἀρχὴν τοιαύτην ἐπιτίθει· "Ἦδη πότε
 " πελαγοδρομήσεις καὶ πολλὴν ἔρημον διοδεύσας
 " ἡξιώθην ὑπὸ θεῶν λιμέντος· ἀκινδύνου τύχην
 " καὶ μὲν ἀσφαλεστάτης. By which we un-
 derstand the Pains and Industry both these
 Authors used in accomplishing themselves
 in this superstitious and uncertain Science.
 Which will make them both the more re-
 gardable in their kind. Then it is obser-

able how differently these two *Heathen* Authors speak concerning the *Divinity* owned by them. What *Critodemus* expresses in the *plural* number ὑπὸ Θεῶν, that *Vettius Valens* mentions in the *singular* number only ὑπὸ Θεῶ, both of them according to the custom of their *Age*. The *Philosophers*, after our Saviour's time, introduced that *new* Form of Speech, making their Addresses rather to the *Supreme Being* immediately, than to the *Popular Deities*, and by reducing all of them to the *Sun*, in favour of *Alagabalus*, as appears in *Macrobius*. This Work is an *Anthology*, collected out of the *eldest* and *best* Authors of the kind, together with his *own* Observations and Improvements in this Book, to which this *Preface* belongs. This was the way also of *Julius Firmicus*, an Author whose *Age* is better known. This makes it very difficult to determine the *Collector's Age* from the *Astrological Calculations* mentioned in it, because it is so difficult to distinguish *whose* the Calculations are, whether of the *Collector*, or of some of the *Authors* out of whom he made his Collection. The *latest* Note that I have observed in a cursory view of him, is of the *xxi* Year of *Antoninus Pius*. The *Collector* mentions one Βάλνς. If this be the same with *Vettius Valens*, the *Collector* cannot be *Vettius Valens*, but some *later* Man, who has excerpted *Vettius*

tius as well as others. Whoever he be, he makes the *Air* to be the place of *separate Divine Souls*, and that *part* of the *Air* which has also the Appellation of *Æther*. And he takes this to have been the Sense of the *Divine Orpheus*, whom the *Heathen* thought *inspired*, and reckon for one of their first Θεόλογοι, in the same sense as *S. John* the Evangelist and *S. Gregory Nazianzen*, are called also Θεόλογοι, as observing the *Phraseology* of the most antient *Derivers of Tradition* from the freshest *Memory* of what Mankind had received from the *Divine Revelations*, before the *Divine familiar Conversation* with Mankind was interrupted. From this *Æther* he derives the *ρίζωμα* of Souls, as the *Pythagoreans*, in their *Golden Verses*, make the *Elements* the *ρίζώματα* of all sublunary Bodies. So our *Microcosm* is compared to a *Tree* having its *Root* in *Heaven*, and the *τελεγκὺς* is made the *παρὰ ἀεὶ ἄε φύσις* by the same *Pythagoreans*. So our Author also makes our *Death* to be a payment of a *debt* to that same *Air* from whence we received our Souls, ὅποτε εἰς τὸ αἶρα ἀναδραμῇ τὸ χρέος. So *Death* is commonly called the *τὸ χρέος*, as this *Return* of our Souls to the *Air* from whence they first came, is, in the Language of the *Scripture*, a *Return* of our *Spirits upwards to God* that made them. It is here called ἀνάλυσις εἰς τὸ οἰκεῖον τόπον. Exactly
as

The Distinction between

as in S. Paul; ὁ χειρὸς τῆ ἐμῆς ἀναλύσεως ἐφάρηκε, 2 Tim. iv. 6. τῷ ὀπιδυμίαν ἔχον εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι, καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶ, Phil. i. 23. As our ἐκδήμους ἐκ τῆ σωματικῆς is our ἐκδήμους πρὸς τὴν κύριον, 2 Cor. 5. 8. whom we are to meet εἰς τὴν αἰετα, 1 Thess. iv. 17.

So also *Hermes Trismegistus* in *Stobæus*: Τὸ ὃ ἀπὸ σελήνης, ὡς τέκνον, ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, ψυχῶν ὅσιν οἰκῆται, which afterwards he calls *Air*. This was the *Egyptian Philosophy* of those times, which all bore the name of *Hermes*, as the *Chaldaic* bore the name of *Zoroastres*, and the *Pythagoreans* wrote many of them under the name of their Master *Pythagoras*. And it is manifest, how much influence that *Egyptian Hypothesis* had, not only on the earliest *Hereticks*, who were many of them *Egyptians*, but also on the *Catholicks* themselves, as they expressed their *Divine Revelation* in the Language of the *Hellenists*, who had no where more flourishing *Colonies* than in *Egypt*, and the *Greek parts of Africa*, which depended on it. Here we have the *Greek Word* exactly answering the word *habitaculum* mentioned in the antient *Latin Authors* now produced. This therefore is the Ἄδης which contains both sorts of *Souls* in it till the day of *Judgment*, the *Bad* as well as the *Good*. Accordingly it has sometimes the name of *Heaven*, sometimes of *Hell*, which has occasioned considerable mistakes in the lower Fathers

Fathers who did not observe it. Especially *S. Augustine*, who rather pleased himself in Reasoning from received Opinions, than in consulting Originals. It was the lower Heaven, as partaking of *Light*; and the uppermost Hell, as partaking of that *Darkness* which is the Characteristick of those Regions which we call *Infernal*. This Distinction of both States is commonly owned by the Writers of that Age, Sacred and Prophane, as well as by the modern Rabbins. And the Revolutions of Night and Day were sufficient to make them believe the Air inhabited both by good and bad Spirits, according to the Reasonings of those Times. For they judged of the Mystical Light and Darkness, by the Light and Darkness that was sensible. The Heavens therefore properly so called (having no returns, nor mixture of Darkness) they assigned to the pure Spirits, which had no Contagion of Matter or material Affections. And, on the contrary, there being no access of Light to the Subterraneous Regions, they were accordingly allotted to the worst of Spirits, that were at the furthest distance and opposition to the Mystical Light. It was therefore agreeable, That the middle space between both, having its Vicissitudes of the sensible Light and Darkness, should be possessed by suitable Inhabitants of both sorts, but neither of them so absolute in their kinds as those were
who

who were lodged in the *pure Light* and the *unmixed Darknefs*. Yet, though both *sorts* be in the same *Space*, they were supposed to have different *Residences*, and in *different Bodies*, so as to have no *Communication* with each other. That is plainly implied in the *great Gulph fixed* between them, mentioned in the Parable of the *Rich Man* and *Lazarus*, and where the *Apostle* denies all *κοινωνία* between *Light* and *Darknefs*. Meaning such as he, supposes between the *Members* of those *different Bodies* respectively, and among themselves. And indeed the *Grossness* of their *Vehicles* was sufficient to *cause* that *Distinction* of their *situation*, according to that *Philosophy* which is alluded to by the *Sacred Writers* of the *New Testament*. That *Grossness* was occasioned by their *Aversion* to *Heavenly* things in this *Life*, and their having preferred *Material* Enjoyment *before* them. Accordingly they who had most *immersed* themselves in *Corporeal* Pleasures, contracted thereby the heaviest grossest *Vehicles*, which naturally *depressed* them to the *lower Places*, in *proportion* to their *Earthly* inclinations *here*; which did withal possess them with the most *vicious Habits*, and the most *devilish Delights* in doing *Mischief* and the most *devilish Aversion* to the *Society* of those who were *better* and most *religiously* disposed. Thus the *distance* between them would *result* from

Cl. Winder.
de Vit.
funct. stat.
§. 13.

from the several *Dispositions* of the *lowest happy Soul*, and the *Supreme* of those which were *unhappy*, and the *corporeal Gravity* of their *αἰδωλον* consequent to those *Dispositions*. And there must be the like *distance* among *Souls* of the *same rank* as there was between their *Immersion* in *Matter*, consequent to the *Habits* contracted by the different use of their *Free-will*, when they were yet in their *Bodies*. However, though there were no *Conversation* between *happy* and *unhappy Souls*: Yet the *Devils* (at least, that *less defiled* part of them which were only excluded from *Heaven*, but suffered to exercise their *Authority*, like *Princes*, in the *darkness* of the *Air*) must consequently have a liberty of *ranging* so far as that *darkness* of the *Air* reached, and so far as the extent of *ὕλη*, of which they were the *Managers* for *mischievous Purposes*. This was indeed as far as the *Moon*, which was taken for the *Crater* of *Souls* designed for *Bodies*. This was the *lowest Orb* of those *Bodies*, which, in an *appropriated* sense, are taken for *Cælestial*. And thus far the power of *Evil Spirits* was commonly thought to extend in *Eclipses* of the *Moon*, which were, for some time, ascribed by the *Vulgar*, to the influence of such *Spirits* endeavouring to offer violence to the *Moon*, by the practices of *Witches*, with whom they corresponded. These *Spirits* therefore
they

they pretended to *affright* away by *Noises*. And, when they had attained more Skill in *Astronomy*, and knew that the *cause* of that *Darkness* was the *Interception* of the *Sun's Light*, by the *Interposition* of the *Earth* between the *Sun* and the *Moon*; yet that *Darkness* was sufficient, on that *Hypothesis*, to make it reduceable to the *Dominion* of the *Prince of Darkness*. And this is the *Slavery* to *Death* and the *Devil*, to which *Mankind* was condemned by *Adam's Fall*, that, whereas *God* designed *Man* for *Immortality*, by that *Union* with the *Immortalizing Spirit*, which *God* was pleased to put in his *Power* at his first *Creation*; when he had, by his own *Fault*, lost that *Spirit*, he was, from that time, *confined* to that *Region of Mortality*, the *Kingdom of Death*, which was *natural* to him; and thereby made *subject* to him who has the *κράτος* of *Death*, that is, the *Devil*, *Ebr. ii. 14.* His having the *κράτος* of that *Kingdom of Death*, implies him to be the *Prince* of that *ἐμπρατεία*. And so indeed he is, as is the *Prince* of this *World*, of the *Darkness* of it, which is the *Region of Mortality*, relating to the *invisible State*, which is signified by the Word *Ἄδης*. Thus all *Mankind* were made obnoxious to that *Government* which was allowed the *Devil* by *God* himself, after his *Expulsion* from *Heaven*. But no farther than *God* had been pleased to al-

low it him, and with those *Restrictions* which God had reserved, for the *Good* of those whom he should be pleased to take into his own *Protection*, and the *Guard* of those good *Angels* who officiated under him as *ministring Spirits*, for the good of the *Heirs of Salvation*, Ebr. i. 14. This was really a *right* of the *Peculium*, as they were a *Theocracy*, under the *immediate* Government of the *Λόγος*, and not committed by him, like other *Nations*, to a *subordinate* Government by *Tutelar Angels*. And this was such a *Curb* to the *νομοκρατορες* as confined their *Power* over such *Souls* to very *narrow* Bounds, even whilst the *Souls* themselves were, by the *Grossness* of their *shady Bodies*, confined within those *Jurisdic-tions*, wherein they were *allowed* an *Exercise* of *Power* by the *Laws* of their *Creator*. For these *separate Souls* are said to be *with the Lord*, to return to him that gave them; and so, that no *Torment* can touch them. So the *Hellenists*, *Wisd.* iii. 1. and every way agreeably to the *inspired Writings*. The *Protection* is certainly greater there than in this *World*, as God and good *Spirits* are more *present* there, and as the *Power* of the God of this *World* must needs be greater, where the *Matter* is *grosser* and more *impure*. Yet, even here, the *Devil* himself gives this account of God's *Providence* over *Job*: Hast thou not made a *hedge* about him, and about his

his house, and about all that he hath on every side? *Job* i. 10. I know not therefore, wherein this *Slavery* of these *separate happy Souls* to the *Devil* could consist, unless possibly, in obliging them to *appear* here below, against their *own Wills* in Compliance with those *Laws of Providence*, which suffered it, for Reasons concerning the good *Government of our World*, though *unknown* to us. For *Porphyry*, in *Stobæus*, tells us, that *Souls* which have passed the *Styx*, for-
ubi supra. get their Concerns *here*, but withal retain such an *Aversion* for all their *past Acquaintance* here, as *never* to appear to any *willingly*, nor without the *Authority* of *Pluto* and *Proserpine*, obliging them to do so. That they make to have been the Case of *Alcestis* granted to *Hercules*, and of *Eurydice* to *Orpheus*. Both of them by *Pluto* and *Proserpine*. That *Prince* of the *Darkness* of this *Air*, is the same with the *Pluto* of the *Poets*, the *Lord* of *Adms*. And it could be no other than *he* that obliged the *Soul* of *Samuel* to *appear* and give *Responses* to *Saul*, on account of the *Necromantick* Adjurations of the *Witch* of *Endor*. That he was *forced* to do so, appears by his own Words; *why hast thou disquieted me?* which are *not* the Words of one that came *willingly*, nor of a *good Man* coming by the *Command* of *God*. Yet the *eldest Jews* thought it no *Disparagement* to their *Patriarch* to believe

believe him to have been *real Samuel* that was so *disquieted*. The Son of *Sirach* thought so, *Ecd.* xlvii 23. and reckons it among his Glories, that, even then, he *prophefied*: Nor does *Josepbus* intimate the least Doubt of it, where he relates the Story, *Ant.* vi. 15. These are the eldest *Jewish* Authors, next the *Scriptures*, that mention it, of whose *time* we are certain. The eldest *Christian Writer*, who takes notice of it, is *Justin Martyr*; and he is full in the Point, not only concerning *Samuel*, but concerning the *Souls* of all *righteous Men*, and *Prophets*: Φαίνεται δὲ καὶ ὅτι πᾶσαι αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν ἔτιως δικαίων καὶ προφητῶν ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν ἐπιπλόν τῶν τοῖστων δυνάμεων, ὅποια δὴ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐγγαστριμυθῷ ἐκείνῃ ἐξ αὐτῶν πραγμάτων ὁμολογεῖται. So *Origen* also (that *Master of the Church next the Apostles*, as *S. Jerome* stiles him before his *Quarrels* concerning him.) I say this very *Origen*, in a just Discourse of this Subject, though not so consistently with his Hypothesis of the *natural Immortality of Human Souls*. So also *Anastasi- us Antiochenus* expressly asserts, that all the *Souls*, as well of the *Saints* as of the *Wicked*, were under the *Power* of the *Devil*, till they were delivered by *Christ*. And he so expounds the Words of *S. Paul*, that *death* (that is, says he, the *Devil*) *reigned over all from Adam to Moses*. But the Instance of *Samuel* shews, that this *Power* is not to be

S

confined

Dial. cum Tryph. P. 333.

Orig. de Engastrimutbo.

Origen. Q. 112.

confined to the time of Moses. All are supposed by *S. Justin* to be in the same Condition, even *since Christ*. And that he gives, as the Reason of the *Prayers* of the *Church* for *departing Souls*, that they might be delivered from the Molestations of these *Evil Angels*, and interprets a Passage of the *Psalmist* to this Purpose. This I believe might be the Occasion of those antient *Liturgies* produced by *Primate Usher*, wherein we find *Prayers* for *Patriarchs*, *Prophets*, the *Apostles*, the *Martyrs*, even the *Blessed Virgin* her self, though those *Ages*, wherein those *Liturgies* were introduced, had entertained the highest Opinions of her Happiness, beyond that of any mere *Creature*. Not only as owning them all as one *Body* with the *Militant Church* on *Earth*, but as believing them to need their *Prayers* whilst they were in those *separate Mansions* accessible by the *Devil*. This was the Case of those who sinned without a *positive Law*, such as *Adam* had, and did, in regard of the generality of *Mankind*, expire with *Moses*; yet it is certain, that the *Kingdom* of *Death* did not do so. The *Apostle* reckons *Death* as the last *Enemy* that shall be subdued by our *Lord*, 1 *Cor.* xv. 26. not certainly, till the general *Resurrection*. So long therefore even these *good Souls* must be some way under him who has the *κράτος* of that *βασιλεία*. I have already shewn, that even the

the *Apostles* were thought to go to *Adms*, by the Apostolical *Hermas*. Yet these are reckon'd in the *Scripture* and the same *Hermas*, as the *Foundations* of the *Church*, next to *Christ* the chief corner *Stone*, in Allusion to the Passage of the *Psalmist*, on which *all* the other Members of the *Church* are to be *superstructed*. Thence it appears, that even *new baptized* Persons, and *Martyrs* (whose Case is believed *equal* to that of those who die in their *Baptismal Purity*) being *incorporated* into the *same Body* with the *Apostles*, and *built* upon *them*, cannot be exempted from that *State*, to which the *Apostles* themselves are liable. And, if these be not exempted, I know none *others* that can *pretend* to it. Nor can I perceive any *Inconvenience* in it, so long as this *Slavery* to the *Devil* does not make them obnoxious to any *Pains* that can be inflicted by the *Devil*, but only some *Disquietudes*, wherein they might be *relieved* by the *Prayers* of the *Living*, according to the Opinion of *S. Justin Martyr*. It is certain, that, even in these *separate Receptacles*, these *purser Souls* are said to be *happy*, and to be with *Christ*, notwithstanding this *Slavery* to the *Devil*, whilst they are in these *Regions of Mortality*; and therefore that their *Slavery* cannot make them liable to such *Inconveniences*, as may be *inconsistent* with their *Happiness*; nor, that their *Disquietudes* can

The Distinction between

be so great, as to hinder their State from being a State of *Rest*, as to the *main*, as the *Scripture* describes it. But how is it reconcilable, that they can be in *Heaven*, as being with *Christ*; and yet in *Adns*, as not being altogether free from the *Power* of the *Devil*? Very well: There is the *uppermost* and the *nethermost Hell* or *Gebenna*. And there is the *Heaven*, and the *Heaven of Heavens*, or far above all *Heavens*, in the Language of the *Scripture*, the *Pleroma*, in the Language of the *Gnosticks*. Both *Heavens* are places of *Happiness*, as both *Hells* are supposed to be in the *Power* of the *Devil*. The *Difference* is this: The *lower Heaven* is the place of the *less perfect Happiness*, as the *uppermost Hell* is the place where the *Devil's Power* is most *restrained*, as it must be where it cannot hinder the *Inhabitants* from being *happy*. And both these *Qualifications* may agree to the *Air*, in the *Bounds* now described, as it is a *mixture* of *mystical Light* and *Darkness*, answerable to those *Vicissitudes* of *visible Light* and *Darkness* here supposed. As all the *space* between the *Air* and the *Earth* is the *Seat* of *Mortality*, and not properly *Heaven*; so it is contained under the *Kingdom* of *Death*, and of him that has the *Power* of *Death*, as being all *Air*, in *Opposition* to *Heaven*, properly so called. But as it has *Light*, and, in the places *nearest Heaven*,
more

more *pure* and *unmixt*, comparatively with what is more *remote* from *Heaven*, and (for that Reason) more *mixt* with *Darkness*; so it has the Name of *Æther*, as contradistinguished from *Air* in a more restrained Sense, and is accordingly capable of that *Happiness* ascribed to it in the *Scripture*. This Distinction is owned by the *Scholiast* on *Homer*, who bears the Name of *Didymus*. He makes *three* Spaces of the *Heavenly* Regions: one of the *Air*, μέχρι In Homer Il. Θv. 16. νεφελῶν, ἔπειτα αἰθέρα μέχρι τῶν φαινομένων, that is, the *starry Heaven*, so called by *Aratus* in his *φαινόμενα*. The *third* therefore is that of the several *Orbs* of the *starry Heaven* it self. Which therefore was, very probably, the *third Heaven*, into which *S. Paul* was caught, of *greater* Dignity than the *ordinary Heaven* of the *Blessed*, in which they are supposed to be at *present*. This *second Region* therefore seems to be the place of *happy Souls*, till the *Resurrection*. This *S. John* places ὑποκρίτω τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, which he Rev. vi. 9. allots even to the *Martyrs* themselves, the *highest* Rank of the *ordinary Blessed*. That *Altar* he calls the *Golden Altar* before the *Throne of God*, *Rev. viii. 3. ix. 3.* No doubt, in Allusion to the *Golden Altar of Incense*, which was in that part of the *Jewish Temple*, which was accessible to *none* but the *Priests*. Accordingly the *Oblations* offered on it, are θυμιάματα, *Rev. v. 8.* and *Frankincense*,

incense, Rev. viii. 3, 4. Plainly relating to the *Archetypal Altar*, and the *Archetypal Oblations* offered by the *Archetypal High-Priest* himself in *Heaven*. And *Heaven* is the place which *God* himself, in the *Prophet*, calls his *Throne*, Is. lxvi. 1. And so does our *Saviour*, S. *Matth.* v. 34. xxiii. 22. Who can doubt but that this *Altar before the Throne of God*, can be no other but that *Archetypal Altar in Heaven*, properly so called? The *Martyrs* therefore, which are under that *Altar*, cannot be thought to be in *Heaven* it self. The *Passage* in the *Revelations* it self, supposes them otherwise. They are warned, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also, and their brethren that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled, Rev. vi. 11. This ἀνάπαυσις is plainly that which is ascribed to the *Righteous departed Souls* by Is. liii. 2. and which is alluded to in *Ebr.* iii. 18. and which is *Heaven*, the *Mystical Canaan*, in Allusion to that of the *Israelites* in the *Earthly Canaan*, into which they were introduced by *Joshua*, the Type of our *Jesus*, *Ebr.* iv. 8, 9. And when this *Rest* is mentioned as likely to last but for a little season, till all their *Fellow Martyrs* should have suffered also. That must be till the day of *Judgment*, and seems plainly to allude to that *Accession of Happiness*, which they might then expect, as *Primate Usher* has

has observed from several Passages of the *Scripture*, as well as of *Ecclesiastical Offices* relating to it. Yet he was not aware of that easie account of it, by their Translation from this *Subcælestial Region* into *Heaven*, properly so called. The *Rabbins* also seem agreed in the same Notion, when they make the *Residence* of *happy Souls* under the *Throne of Glory*. Nor do I know any more likely *Original* of this Opinion among them, than this place of *S. John*. That *Situation* under the *Altar*, which is *before the Throne*, will very naturally make it *under the Throne*. And I know no Footsteps of this form of speaking in *Philo*, or *Josephus*, or any other Author of their *Nation* of unquestionable Antiquity, and near the *Apostles Age*. Yet *Philo* owns the *Golden Altar of Incense* the more *holy* of the two, as I have shewn in my Discourse against *Occasional Communion*. And the *Archetypes* of that, as well as of all other *Uten- sils* of the *Temple*, he places in *Heaven* as *S. Paul* does, and as the *Platonists* did all sorts of their *Idea*, which *Word* he also uses in speaking of these Matters. The *place* therefore of the most *happy Souls*, till the *Day of Judgment*, must be the *middle place* now mentioned from the pretended *Didymus*. So the *lowermost* of those *three Partitions* will remain for the *less perfectly good Souls*, that may need any *expiatory Pains* for fit-

Cl. Win-
det. de Vit.
funt. stat.
c. 7.

ting them for the *superior Regions*. And the *Inflictors* of those *Pains* upon them, may be either those *Devils* who are allowed a *Power* in *this Region* with *less* *Restraint*, than in the *higher* now mentioned, the ἀνδρες δαίμονες mentioned by *Plato*, the *evil Angels* in the *Psalmist*, as *Instruments* of *Punishment*; or, perhaps the *Angel* of *Repentance* mentioned in *Hermas*, as a *good Angel*, and as designing all his *Chastisements* for the *Good* of those who are committed to his *Care*; but rather the *Devils* who were the *Executioners* of *Ecclesiastica Censures*, on those who deserved them, even in *this Life*. Yet under the *Restraint* of such *good Beings* as the *Angels* of *Repentance*, when those *Chastisements* were inflicted on those who retained *amendable Habits* of *Vices* contracted in *this Life*. These things may, at least, give a probable *Account* of the *Sense* of the *Antients* in this *Matter*. But for the *middle Region*, of which I was speaking, we see the *Scholias*t now mentioned, calls it *Æther*, in *Contradistinction* to *Air*, which is enough to qualify it for the *Residence* of *Spirits*, and the fairest *Candidates* for *Immortality*. For this is the *Philosophical Term* for that *quinta essentia* (as the *Peripateticks* call'd it) that constituted *Cœlestial Bodies*. This will *proportionably* entitle this *upper sublimary Region* of *Air* as *Æther* to the Name of *Heaven*,

ven, and the *Inhabitants* of it to *Immortality*, as it entitles them to the *true Heaven*, as already *Spiritual*, and already partaking of this *Æther*. So the *Pythagoreans*.

Ἦν δ' ἀπολευσας σῶμα ἰς αἰδιρ̃ ἐλεύθερον
ἐλθης.

Ἔσται ἀδανάτῳ δεὸς ἀμβροτῶ, ἐκ ἐπὶ
δυνήϊος.

The *Æther* is said to be ἐλεύθερος as *free* from the *Slavery* of the *Dæmon* ὕλης, whom the *Scripture* calls the *Devil*. And the Ἀδανάτοι θεοί, in those *Golden Verses*, are the *Inhabitants* of the *Æther*, as the Ἡρώες are the *Inhabitants* of the *Air* properly so called, as bounded by the *Earth* below; and the κατὰ χθονίους δαίμονες are the *Manes* from the *surface* of the *Earth* downwards. This is the κατὰ οὐρανὸν φῶς desired by *Ignatius* in the *Epistle* to the *Romans*, as a place proper for *Martyrs*, as being *above* those *Clouds* which intercept the *Sun's Light*, and darken the *World*, and are *Symbols* of the like *Mystical Darkness* to the *Inhabitants* of it. Therefore the *Author* of *Philopatris*, calls the *Christians* αἰδεῖς and αἰδεσβατῆντας and ἀεσβατῆνται. The *last* is the word used by *Aristophanes* in his *Νεφέλαι*, where he ridicules *Socrates*. From whom that *Author* takes the *Fancy* of the *measure* of the *leap* of a *Flea*, which *Aristophanes* makes calcu-

calculated by *Socrates* also. This Author takes occasion thence to expose the *Christian* hopes of *Immortal Happiness* on account of their pretences to this *Ætherial Region*, on pretence of their having the *Spirit*, by turning the *Scoff* of *Aristophanes* upon them. But he adds the mention of of their *ἀιδεσθαι*, in order to the making them more ridiculous than *Socrates*, who contented himself with the *Air*, a Region below the *Christians*. Whilst therefore these *Holy Souls* are in this *Æther*, they are said to be *with the Lord*, not only as they are *one Body* and *one Spirit* with him. For so they are in *this World* also, and are reckon'd as in him also, as well as he and the *Father* are said to be in them. The *Λόγος* is by the *Platonists*, as well as the *Christians*, made the *Governour* of *this World*. And, as such, his proper *Residence* should be in *this World*. And no where more peculiarly than in that most excellent *supreme Region* of it. Withal, it is the *Privilege* of the *Peculium* to be immediately under the *Government* of the *Λόγος*, and to be so far exempt from those *subordinate Governours*, (to whom that same *supreme Governour* has permitted *other Societies*) as they have qualified themselves, for receiving the *Benefits* of this *Government*, by their *Purity* in *Flesh* and *Spirit*. And, whatever was the *Case* of *Samuel* and the old *Patriarchs*,

as to the particular of the Devil's power over them in the *state* of Separation; yet there is reason to believe that *their* Case is better under the Gospel. The Platonists themselves believe that, in the Iron Age, towards the end of the *Annus Magnus*, after the desertion of the Gods, of whom the last was *Astræa*, the Government of the World was impair'd, and permitted to *Ἰλν* and *Ἀνάγκη*, and therefore more liable to the interposition of Evil Spirits. But, withal they held that, upon the beginning of a new Revolution, on the return of *Astræa* and the other Gods, and the *nova progenies de cælo*, the new Creature; the Λόγος undertook the Helm, the *πιδάλιον*, as Plato calls it, and that then the Golden Age of Saturn was to return, which was to put an end to the mischiefs of the former Misgovernment. So *Hesiod*, and *Virgil* in his famous *Eclogue*. He there makes the Boy, upon whose Birth the Golden Age was to commence (which *Constantine* the Great interprets Mystically of our Saviour) to put an end to all the mischiefs then prevailing.

Orat. ad
Sanct. cat.
ap. Euseb.
c. 19. III.

*Te duce, siqua manent sceleris vestigia nostri,
Irrita perpetuâ solvent formidine terras.*

Particularly he has these words: *Occidet & Serpens*. Which the same great Emperour interprets of the Devil, so well known by the name of the Serpent, who seduced our first Parents in the Scripture. And very pro-

probably the *Poet* might design a *Mystical* meaning by it, when he reckons it among the Privileges of the *Golden Age*. Though his most obvious *literal* Sense may relate to *Python* killed by *Apollo*, whom he afterwards mentions as *King* in the time he speaks of: *Tuus jam regnat Apollo*. But the *New Testament* also is very particular in signifying a *diminution* of the *Devil's Power* upon the appearance of our Saviour. Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the Prince of this world be cast out, S. *Joh.* xii. 31. The Prince of this world is judged, xvi. 11. Elsewhere the place also is mentioned from whence he is to be cast: I beheld Satan as lightning fall from Heaven, S. *Luke* x. 18. which is yet more plainly described in the *Revelations*. in the visionary Dramatical stile of Prophecy. There a *War* is represented between *Michael* and his *Angels*, and the *Dragon* and his *Angels*. The event of which was that *Expulsion* of the *Devil* out of *Heaven* now mentioned. So it follows: Neither was there place found any more in Heaven. And the great Dragon was cast out, that old Serpent, called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the Earth, and his Angels were cast out with him, *Rev.* xii. 8, 9. After this follows the *Epinicion* upon this *Victory*, which concludes thus: Therefore rejoyce, ye Heavens, and ye that dwell

in them. *Wo to the Inhabitants of the Earth, and of the Sea: for the Devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time, v. 12.* Hence it appears plainly that this *Expulsion* cannot be meant of the *Extinction* of the Devil's Power at the day of Judgment, because then there will be no *Inhabitants* of the *Earth* that can suffer by him. And the *Congratulations* made to the *Heavens* upon this *Victory*, and to their *Inhabitants*, prove that those *Inhabitants* were they who were principally concerned in the *Fruits* of this *Victory*. Which could not be, unless they had been *Sufferers* by him whilst he was *conversant* among them. And an instance is given wherein they were *Sufferers* by his neighbourhood, that he was continually provoking God against them by his *Accusations*. The *Accuser* of our Brethren is cast down, which accused them before God, day and night, v. 10. This advantage he had by his residence there, that he appeared in the *Assemblies* of the good *Angels*, as appears in the Book of *Job*, and the History of the seduction of *Ahab's Prophets* by the lying *Spirit*. These opportunities he must lose of doing mischief, when he was no longer allowed liberty of appearing among them. And so the Reason of those *Prayers* for the *Dead*, to preserve them in the state of *Separation*, from those insults of ill *Spirits*, must

The Distinction between

must also *cease* when the *Devils* were now no longer allowed access to them. I know not whether S. *Justin* do not intimate it when he makes the *Prayers* for them in his *time*, to be ἐπ' ἐξόδῳ, as if, *after* their *decease*, when they were *lodged* in their *Aetherial* Stations, they did not *then* so much need the *Prayers* which were made in their *behalf*; but only while the contest was, whether of the *two* sorts of *Spirits* were to be their *Conductors*. But their *Translation* from this *lower* to the *superiour Heaven*, seems to be reserved for the day of *Judgment*. Then *Death* is to be *swallowed up in Victory*, and to be *cast into the bottomless pit*, and *Adns* too. That I take to be, that when the *separate State* should end (as it must do when the *Soul* and *Body* shall be *joyned* together again, and that *eternally*) then the places of *separate Bodies* and *separate Souls* should likewise have an end also. But this *Victory* over *Death*, being the *last*, and therefore immediately preceding the *Triumph* of our *Saviour*, must therefore be at the σωτήρεια, the *Consummation* of all our *Saviour's Mediatorial Office*, as well as of the *World*. Perhaps our *Saviour* intimated this in his saying, *it is finished*, immediately before his own *Death*, because his *own Death* was to be a *means* for evacuating *ours*. Then it is to be *cast into the Abyss*, the *Tzalmuth*, the *shadow of Death*,

Death; as Death made the departed Souls umbras or Shades, and into the Land of Forgetfulness, as if it had never been. Thus our Lord fulfilled that Prophecy of his own. O Death, I will be thy Death: O Grave, I will be thy Destruction, by taking away the places of separate Souls and Bodies, when the State of Separation it self should be at an end. That is, by translating them from the district of the βασιλεία θανάτου and φθορᾶς, into the true Heaven, the proper Region of Immortality. Then he is to surrender his Government to the Father, and to be himself subject to the Father, when he has brought all the Souls which he has purchased, and surrendered them to his Father. For he owns the original Property of them to be in his Father: Thine they were, and thou gavest me them, S. John xvii. 6. His Office therefore is the προσαγωγή, the bringing them to the Father, answerable to the προσήλυσις on our parts, our coming to the Father, to bring many Sons unto Salvation; that is, the Salvation ἐξ ὕλης, out of this present World, in the Language of the Scripture: that is, out of this sublunary World (the Government of which had been committed to him by his Father) by translating us into Heaven, properly so called, which is the peculiar Residence of the Father; for when all things were subjected to him, it is manifest that he must be excepted, who had subjected

subjected them, as the Apostle reasons. That is, that the Father himself cannot be included in the account of the things subjected to the Son: The Father still retains that original superiority that is implied in the Name of Father, as being the original Head of all this mystical Union. He is the same way the Head of Christ Mystical, that is, of all Christ's Mystical Body, and of himself, as deriving the Name of Son from that Spiritual Seed, which had by himself been received from the Father, and which had by him been communicated to all his Mystical Body, making them thereby his Brethren, not his Sons; as Christ himself is the Head of the Man, and the Man also is the Head of the Woman, from whence the Woman's Duty of Subjection is likewise inferred. So this Subjection principally relates to this Filiation of the Son, as he has the fulness of the Spirit, not as he is the Logos; which will perfectly overthrow all the Reasonings of the Arians, as well as of our modern Socinians. By the Roman Laws, a Son and Heir in Univocal Generation (and therefore equal with the Father in their common Nature) yet compared with the Father, differed very little from a Servant, as the Apostle reasons, either in Subjection or Property, whilst the Father lives; which must hold eternally, where the Generation is Eternal, and the Father is supposed to live for ever.

And

And even the *Catholick Fathers* own a *Subordination* of the *Son* to the *Father*, as not derogatory to their *Consubstantiality*, and take it to be the Sense of his own Words: *My Father is greater than I*: and this in regard of the *Λόγος* it self. Thus therefore the *Son*, when he has *finished* all the *Concerns* of the *Province* committed to him by his *Father*, and *translated* all his *Subjects* into *Heaven*, the *District* of his *Father* must then be *subject* to him, as a *Prince*, returned from his *Province*, is, when he returns from it into the *peculiar Jurisdiction* of his *Father*. And to shew that the Case is indeed so, it is very observable, that, when the *Scripture* describes our *Blessed Lord's coming to Judgment*, it mentions no other *Attendants* but his *Holy Angels*; no *Patriarchs*, no *Prophets*, no *Apostles*, no, nor any *Martyrs*, nor any other *Order* whatsoever of *created Souls*. We are, on the contrary, said to *meet him in the Air*. Not only as our then-raised *Bodies* are to be lifted from their *Graves* in *Earth*, but as they are in the *Air*, the *Advs* of *Souls*, to *meet* those *Souls* which are to be *united* to them. Then our *Bodies* also will by him be made *Pneumatical*, when they are *fashioned like his glorious Body*, and fitted for the *Wings* of the *Spirit*, which will then *translate* them to the *highest Heavens*, the *Regions of Immortal Happiness* by the Reason-

T

ings

ings of the *Apostle*, in the *Epistle* to the *Corinthians*.

56. This is the *Divine Spirit*, by which all the *Mystical Union* and *Communion* is maintained. They who partake of it are said to have the *ἑνωτικὴν πνεύματος*, and to be one Spirit with each other. Yet so as to oblige them to *Unite* in the *Principle* from whence they receive it, as in a common *Head*, as *Brethren* in the *Patriarchal Bodies* were obliged to depend on their *eldest Brother* as the *Successor* of their common *Father*, as to all those *Rights* which the interests of *Societies* made *Indivisible*. Thus *God* created man in his own likeness, male and female created he them, and called their name *Adam*, *Gen. v. 1, 2*. Here the *Spirit* seems to be meant by the *likeness* of *God*, which elsewhere is ascribed to *Adam* alone, but here to his *Wife* as well as him, as being given *Her* by *Consequence*, as being *One* with *Him*, and with this very *Design* of making her *One* with him. So *Malachy* urges it as an *Argument* for the *Unanimity* of *Conjugal* Consorts: *The Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously. Yet is she thy companion, and the wife of thy Covenant. And did not he make one? Yet had he the residue of the Spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly Seed, Malach. ii. 14.* Here the *Matrimonial Unity*

This Spirit is the Principle of Mystical Unity, as obliging all that receive it, to depend on him from whom they all originally received it. What is meant by *ἑνωτικὴν*, or having Life in himself.

is attributed to the *Spirit* given to both *Consorts*, to *sanctifie* them in order to the producing a *holy Seed*, and to the making them *One*. Alluding plainly to that *likeness* to *God*, which is in *Genesis* ascribed to that *Adam*, who is there said to have been *Female* as well as *Male*; not to *Eve* at all, though to her also as *one* with him, and indeed in order to the making her *one Spirit* with him, as the *Matrimonial Contract* had made them *one Body*. Yet so, the *Spirit* being given *immediately* to *Adam*, and to *Eve* no otherwise than as *one* with him; this made *Adam* the *Head* of this *Union*, and obliged the *Woman* to a *Dependence* on the *Man* for this *participation* of the *Spirit* derived from him, in order to the *Procreation* of a *holy Seed*. When therefore the *unbelieving Husband* was sanctified by the *believing Wife*; it seems principally intended for a *Convert Wife*, who had been married when both were *Infidels*. But, if, after a *Divorce*, or a *Decease* of a *Husband* of the *Peculium*, her *Children* by an *Infidel* were counted of the *holy Seed*; this must have been rather on account of *Favour* to the *Children* than any *Reason* or *Merit* derivable from such a *Parent*. And so it self, an account of the *Holiness* received formerly. Thus the *Man* is called the *Head* of the *Woman*, 1 Cor. xi. 3. Eph. v. 23. Not on a *Civil* account only, but a *Religious*

and *Mystical* one. I mean, in *Marriages* contracted in the *Peculium*. Thence the concern of *Christian Ministers* in *Christian Marriages*, even from the time of the *Apostles* themselves, as appears from *Ignatius*. The *Man* is said to be the *Head* of the *Woman*, as *Christ* is the *Head* of the *Man*, and as *God* is of *Christ*, 1 *Cor.* xi. 3. And as *Christ* is called the *Head* of his *Church* as her *Mystical Bridegroom*; and as he is the *Head* of all *Principality* and *Power*, *Col.* ii. 1. *Angels and Authorities and Powers being made subject unto him*, 1 *S. Pet.* iii. 22. And all on the same account of this *Divine Spirit*, and the *Original* from whence it is derived. The *Man* is the *Head* of the *Matrimonial Union*, because the *Woman* receives the *Residue* of that *Spirit* which is given to the *Man*. So is *Christ* the *Head* of *Man*, because even *he* can pretend no otherwise to this same *Spirit*, than as he is *Baptized* into that *Body*, with which *Christ* also is pleased to contract a *Mystical Marriage*; and thereby to communicate, out of his own *Fulness* of the *Spirit*, those particular *Gifts* and *Graces* of that same *Spirit*, as the *Nuptial Arrba*, and *Donum antemptiale*, of this most Sacred *Conjugal Bond*, which are requisite both for the *Safety* of their *Souls*, and for discharging their *Duties* in their respective stations in the *Body Politick* of the *Church*. So also is the *Head* of

of the *Cœlestial* Orders of *Angels*, because they must receive those *Spirits*, which make them *πνύματα λειτουργία*, from the same *Fulness* of the *Spirit* which *dwells* in him. In this regard the *Heavenly* state to which our *Lord* has exalted us, by giving us this *Spirit*, is an *ἰσαγγελία*. They are called *Sons of God* in the Book of *Job* and elsewhere. Which makes us their *Brethren*, as partaking of the same *immortal Seed* of the *Spirit* of the *Father*. And our *Lord* is justly called the *πρωτότοκος* & *πάσης κτίσεως*, as the *Original* and *Head* of all the *καινή κτίσις*, the new Colonies of *Spirits*, without being any *κτίσις* himself, but as possessing the *Fulness* of that *Seed* of the *Father*, which gives *Creatures* the honour of a *Cœlestial* and *Divine* Extraction, by being joyned with them, not by being it self created, but by being sent to inhabit them as *κτίσις* or *Coloni* were in a new founded City, who did not begin their *Being* when they began their *Habitation*. This Notion of *κτίσις* neither the *Arians* of old, nor our modern *Socinians* were aware of, that I know of. The first *Habitation* therefore of this *Spirit* was in the *Human Nature* of *Christ*, which yet was it self as *Eternal* as his own *Λόγος*, by which the *World* it self was created. Thus also *God the Father* was the *Head* of *Christ*, as being the first *Original* of the same *Spirit*, and from whom

whom *Christ* himself received it. But in another way from that by which the *Angels* and *we* receive it from *Christ*. It proceeds from the *Father* as the *Seed* of the *Father*, and under that Notion is derived to the *Man Christ*, so as to make *him* also the *Son* of the *Father*. Yet so as to reserve to *him* all the *Rights* of an *Eldest Son*, because it is not derived to any others but by *him*. Not even to the *Angels* but by *him* as *Αὐτόν*, not unto *Man* but by *him* as the *Original* by which it is derived to other *Men*, which seems to be the Reason, why even the *Post-diluvian Patriarchs* at least, could not receive it till his *Glorification*. Because till then the *Spirit* could not be expected, as the *Apostle* himself expressly testifies, *S. John* vii. 39. Then we have the first Experiment of it in the *Bodies* of the *Saints*, which then rose out of their *Monuments*, and appeared to many in the *Holy City*, *S. Matth.* xxvii. 52, 53. Nor was it fit that it should have been sooner, because it was the *Man Christ*, to whom this *Fulness* of the *Spirit* was given, from which all his *Members* were to receive their *shares* respectively. That seems to be his plain meaning in those words: *As the Father hath Life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have Life in himself: and hath given him Authority to execute Judgment also, because he is the Son of Man*, *S. John* v. 26, 27. The derivative

πνεύ-

ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶντος ἐν αὐτῷ entitles him only to the quickening from whom it is derived, and therefore does not put it in the Power of them who receive it to quicken themselves. That is only in the Power of them who possess it Originally. In them it is the αὐτοζωὴ, as the Scripture supposes it to be in the Father in regard of the Son, and in the Son in relation to us. This is the meaning of the Platonick term αὐτοζωὴ, and therefore imports that it is in the Sons Power to raise his own Body, to lay down his Life, and to take it up again, which is here ascribed to the Man Christ, if the latter part of this Sentence have any connexion with the former. Thus, therefore the Resurrection of our Lord's Body is sometimes ascribed to his Father, sometimes to himself. Very consequently, because the Spirit by which the Son is said to have Life in himself, in relation to the raising his own Body, is notwithstanding it self the Gift of the Father.

57.

Thus there-

Thus the Spirit is represented as a Bond for all of Unity, even in the Originals of the Members of the most Sacred Mystical Unity. The Son himself, as Man, can lay no claim to the Spirit, but in Conjunction with the Father, from whom he is immediately to receive it, as from the first Principle of the Spirit. Nor can the Soul of Man receive it, but by

fore all Members of Churches were obliged to depend on their respective Governours, in order to the receiving of the Spirit.

by its *Conjunction* with the Son, from whom all, who will entitle themselves to it by the *Rules* of the new *Peculium*, must immediately receive it. Thus all *κοινωνία* with the Father depends on the Son. The Father himself dwells in the Light in accessible, 1 Tim. vi. 16. 1 S. Job. iv. 12. Therefore no man hath seen him at any time : The only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him, S. Job. i. 18. Therefore God shines in our hearts in the face of Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. iv. 6. As being the Image of the invisible God, Col. i. 15. *Εἰκὼν* is the word. As we content ourselves to see the Image of the Sun reflected in the Water, when we are not able to behold him with our naked Eye. By him therefore it is, as I have said, that we have *μεγαλειῶν*, as that answers the *Profelytism* of the new *Peculium*, without which we cannot be made *Citizens* of the *Mystical Cœlestial Jerusalem*. So clear it is, that, by this *Headship* of the Father to Christ it is implied, that none can partake of the *Mystical κοινωνία* with the Father but by the Son, any more than any distant Members can partake of the influences of the Head, which do not receive them by *Communication* with those intermediate Members through which they are to be derived. The same also is the Case of Christ himself as the Head, in relation to the

the Spirit; whoever has not the Spirit of Christ is none of his, Rom. viii. 9. As not holding the head, from which all the Body, by joynts and bands, having nourishment, ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God, Col. ii. 19. Where we see this same Reasoning allowed in the Mystical Body, which none can doubt of in the natural Organical Body. No doubt, to let us understand that God intends to deal with us accordingly. And so indeed God has contrived the matter, even among Men, that, though all derive the Spirit from the Son, yet all should not have it from him immediately; but that all should receive it from some one Principal Person who was designed by God as the Principal of their Unity, upon whom he intended they should depend, if they would entitle themselves to the same Spirit. So the Spirit of Moses was to be derived to the LXX Elders, Numb. xi. 17, 25. So Elisba inherited a double portion of the Spirit of Eliab. According to the right of an Elder Brother, by the Law, who was to have twice as much as any of his Brethren of their common Inheritance. So S. John urges his own Communion as the means by which all were to expect Communion with the Father and the Son, 1 S. John i. 3. Implying, on the contrary, that they who did not so entitle themselves could lay no claim to the Mystical Communion with the Father and

The Distinction between

and the Son. And that is indeed supposed in all the *Reasoning* of his *first Epistle*, which plainly supposes all, who were *out* of that *Communion*, to be in *darkness, death* and *error*, the *contraries* to the *benefits* of the *true Communion*, of *Light* and *Life* and *Truth*. He speaks there not only in the name of the *Apostolical College* then joyned to him in *Ephesus*, as when he speaks in the *plural* number; but also in his *own*, as the *Visible Head* of that *Mystical Union* and *Communion*, as the *rightful Head* even of those *Apostles*. The same was afterwards the Case of all *Bishops* who succeeded the *Apostles*, or rather the *Head Apostle* in this very *Prerogative* of being *Heads* of *Catholic Unity*, of being the only *Authorized Representatives* of the *Original Mystical Heads* of it, the *Father* and the *Son*, both as to the *Admission* to this *Union* of the *Spirit*, and *Exclusion* from it, with a *Right* to *oblige* the *Father* and the *Son* to *ratify* their *Acts* in *Heaven*, as I have shewn in my *Parænesis*. Then every *Church* succeeded the *Church* of *Jerusalem* in that *supreme unappealable Power* of *obliging* *God* and *Christ* immediately to *receive* those to the *Heavenly Communion* who were *received* by them, and to *exclude* those from *Heaven* whom they should judge worthy to be so *excluded*, by the *Doctrine* of the *Catholic Church* in the *first* and *purest Ages* of *Ignatius* and *S. Cyprian*. Then every

every *Bishop* had the *same* Power of acting either way in the affairs of his *own Church*, as the *Head Apostle* had, not only for the *District of Jerusalem*, but also for the *whole Church diffusive*, as being then *subject* to the *District of Jerusalem*, as I have endeavoured to prove in my Discourse concerning *One Priesthood* and *One Altar*. The whole Reasoning of the *Scriptures* supposes the *same Dependence* in the Society of the *Church* in relation to the *Spirit*, as there is between the Members of the *Organical Body*, in order to the Communication of *Vital* or *Animal Influences*.

The *Apostle* supposes the like Variety of 58.
Offices in the *Polity* of the *Church*, as there is The Spirit was not, in the earliest Ages, thought derivable to any Members of the Churches, but from the Heads of those Churches.
 in the *Members* of the *Human Body*. He supposes the *same Variety* of *Gifts* and *Graces* of the *Spirit*, requisite for the *discharging* of these *Offices* in the *Church*, as of *natural Powers* and *Influences* for performing the *Functions* of the several *Members* of the *Animal Body*. He makes the *same mutual* needs of each others assistance between the *Political* as between the *Animal Members*. So that even the *noblest Members* of the *Spiritual Society* need the *Gifts* of the *inferiour Members*, as well as the *Inferiours* need the more *honourable Talents* of their *Spiritual Superiours*. Among these *Members* of the *Visible Body* he owns a *Spiritual Head*, as well as *Feet*, or *Hands*, or *Eyes*,
 on

on which the *rest* of the *Members* of the *Political Spiritual Society* must (by the *Tenor* of this *Reasoning*) depend as much for deriving *Spiritual Influences* as the *Animal Members* depend on the *Head* for their *Vital Influences*. This being supposed, it will be as *impossible* for any *Member* of the *Spiritual Body* to have the *Spirit*, when *separated* from the *Head*, as it is for any *Animal Member* to retain any remainder of *Animal Life*, when separated from the *Animal Head*. So it must be if this *Unity* of the *Spirit* be purposely designed by *God* for confederating a *Political Body* under a *Monarchical Head*. They must necessarily *lose* the *Spirit*, who divide themselves from the *Head* of the *Body* from which alone it can be expected. And *God* has contrived the *Fact* so, that it can be expected from *none* besides. *God alone* conveyed the *Spirit* to the *Son*. The *Son alone* gave it to the *Apostles*, first *preparatively*, by *breathing*; then by giving the *Gifts* themselves, with the *Evidences* and *Proofs* that they were really given, to the *satisfaction* of those who *saw* them in the day of *Pentecost*. And the *Apostolical degree* is reckon'd as the *first* of all these *Extraordinary Offices*: first, *Apostles*, secondly *Prophets*, &c. As the *Standard*, of *all* other, even *Extraordinary Officers*, who were not otherwise to be *believed* to have this *Divine Spirit*,

rit, if they pretended to any *Revelations* different from those of the *Apostles*; or to receive it by any *Ministry* besides. The *Spirit* was given to *Cornelius* at the preaching of *S. Peter*, though *without* the *Imposition* of his *Hands*, in that singular *Extraordinary* instance, by which the *Apostle* himself was to be convinced that *God* did not look on *Cornelius* as *unclean*, because he was not *circumcised*. Thence forward the *Ordinary* way of receiving the *Spirit* was only from the *Apostles*, and not otherwise to be received from them than by *Imposition* of their *Hands*. Then whosoever had not so received the *Spirit* could not be presumed to have it at all. Thus the *Unity* of the *Spirit* united all that pretended to it to the *College* of the *Apostles* in general, and in them to *Christ* their *Head*, as being themselves the *Twelve Foundations* on *Christ* himself, as the *chief corner Stone*. For this I have shewn to be the truly *Catholick Archetypal Church*, from *Union* with which all *particular Churches* must derive their stile of *Catholick*, if they will justly pretend to it. But after their *decease*, none but the *Bishops* succeeded the *Apostles* in that high *Prerogative* of giving the *Spirit* by the *Imposition* of their *Hands*. Therefore *Cornelius* argues, that *Novatian*, being *Baptized* a *Clinick*, and wanting the *σφραγίς* of the *Bishop*, he could not have the *Spirit*.

Parzenf.

Ep. ad Fab.
Ant. ap.
Euf. H.E.

Tertu vi. 43.

The Distinction between

Τέτε μὴ τυχόν, πῶς ἂν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι
 ἐτύχε; The Spirit is that by which we are
 sealed after we believed, Eph. i. 13. That
 is, on the Profession of our Faith required
 in Baptism. And sealed to the day of Re-
 demption, Eph. iv. 30. The Seal is that by
 which the εἰκὼν is impressed, that is, of the
 Second Adam, the Lord from Heaven, the
 Spirit, in the Reasoning of S. Paul, which is
 given in our Saviour's Baptism. And the
 notion of Sealing alludes to the Distinction
 God is pleased to make between his own Fa-
 vourites and others, in times of Publick
 Epidemical Calamities. It is called Sealing
 them in their Foreheads, in Ezekiel and the
 Revelations. By which Sealing, as by a
 Mark, God is said to know those who are his,
 as by a Seal, 2 Tim. ii. 19. So the Spirit is
 the Mark by which we have a Title to have
 our bodies Immortaliz'd at the Resurrection,
 which is the Redemption, Rom. viii. 23.
 S. Luke xxi. 28. This therefore was then
 given by the Bishops only, as the Successors
 of the Apostles, as the Spirit was given by
 none but the Apostles, whilst they lived.
 So the Bishop of Asia gave the σφραγίς to
 the young Man recommended to his Care by
 St. John, in the Story mention'd by Clemens
 Alexandrinus: And that in his φώτισμός.
 Which plainly shews, that the σφραγίς τῷ
 νεύματι, here spoken of, is the same with the
 baptismal Spirit, that true φῶς from whence

Τίς ὁ πλῆς.
 σφ. &
 Euf. H. E.
 iii. 23.

OUR

our Saviour's baptism came be entitled to the name of *φωτισμός*. Valesius there shews that the name of *σφραγίς* is used for the *Baptismal Spirit* in the eldest Monuments of the Church, as I have also shewed it so used in the *Scriptures* themselves. This that Bishop took for the *τέλειον φυλακτήριον*, which made him remit of his Care afterwards, when he thought him sufficiently fortified against the attempts of the *Evil Spirit*, by his reception of the *Good Spirit*. Which plainly shews, that the *supreme Baptism* was here intended, the *Peculiar* benefit of which was, to give the *Good Spirit* to those who were rightly disposed for it by the previous *Discipline* they were to undergo while they were *Catechumens*, and by the *Baptism of Water* also. Among the *Principles* of the *Doctrine of Christ*, the *Apostle* reckons *Baptisms*, *Ebr. vi. 1, 2.* in the plural Number: meaning the *Baptism of Water*, as *Distinct* from that of the *Spirit*. And they were indeed more distinct in the Practice of that *Age*, than we now are commonly aware of. The *Baptism of Water* was *Purgative* or *Cathartick*, to use the proper term of that *Age* for expressing their *Initiatory Mysteries*, for purifying from the pollution of former *Sins*, and of the *unclean Spirits*, which were then supposed to possess the purest *Moralists* before their reception into the *Christian Society*. This

Bap-

The Distinction between

Baptism was usually administered by *lower Ministers*, even where the *principal* Person was *present*, by whose *Authority* the Ceremony was performed. Our Saviour himself is said to have *Baptized more Disciples than S. John the Baptist*. Yet not in his own *Person*, but only by his *Disciples*, S. Joh. iv. 1, 2. But he did not give the *Spirit* by them, but at a considerable distance afterwards. Indeed not till after the *Resurrection* at *Pentecost*. Then it was that he *baptized*, even the *Apostles* themselves with the *Holy Ghost* and with *Fire*, that is, with the *Schechinah* of the *fiery cloven Tongues*. So in the Case of *Cornelius*, S. Peter commanded him to be *baptized* with *Water*, after God had *immediately* baptized him and his with the *Holy Ghost*, *Act. x. 48*. It seems the *Baptism* of *Water*, was below the dignity of an *Apostle* to perform in his *Person*. So S. Philip the Deacon *baptized* the believing *Samaritans*, *Act. viii. 12, 13*. But the *Spirit* was not given them till two *Apostles*, S. Peter and S. John, laid their hands upon them, *v. 15, 16, 17*. So among the many *Corinthians* who pretended to be of *Paul*, the *Apostle* himself assures us, that very few had really been *baptized* by him, though the main occasion of those *Divisions* seems to have been, that *each* of them seems to have denominated himself from the *Preacher*, from whom he had received his *Baptism*. I know

know no Expedient so likely for *reconciling* these so seemingly different appearances, as if we should say, that *greater* numbers were *baptized* by his *Authority* in that same Church of *Corinth*, than could pretend the honour to have received their *Water Baptism* from his *Person*, that being a Favour reserved for some *few* of more *eminent* Station, which the Instances now mentioned shew to have been probable, considering the *Sentiments* of that *Age*. Yet it will turn to the same account, if we allow the *greater* number of those *Corinthians*, who gloried in his *Name*, to have received the *higher Baptism* of the *Spirit* by the *Imposition* of his *Hands*, though they had received their *Water Baptism* from some *other* Preacher. This was indeed the *Baptism* that gave *Profelytes* the fairest pretences for *Glorying*. And the *Ministers* of this more *Honourable Baptism* were *themselves* more *honourable*, and therefore more likely to give occasion to *Ostentatious Dividers* to distinguish *Parties* by their *Names*. If this were so, *Apollos* also, the *Head* of those who called themselves from *him*, might have given the *Spirit* also. And it is not improbable but that *second College* of the *Jerusalem Presbyters*, who had *Catholick Jurisdiction*, might have that *Power* so necessary for the first *Foundation* of *Churches*.

U

But

59. But whether they had so then, or not, there appears no likelihood that the last *Apostles*, or *Jerusalem Presbyters*, left any but *Bishops* in possession of that *Right* of conferring the *Baptismal Spirit*. That higher *Baptism* had, in the first *Monuments* of the Church, another *Symbol*, by which the *Spirit* was signified and conferred, distinct from the *Symbol* of *Water*, that of *Oil*. And in this regard, it is reckon'd as a distinct *Sacrament* from the *Water Baptism* by *S. Cyprian*, when he would have Profelyted *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*, received *utroque Sacramento*. Meaning that way of conveying the *Spirit* by *Imposition* of *Hands*, as well as the *Baptism* of *Water*. Yet both of them may be contained under the one common name of *Baptism*, as it was the *Right* of our *Saviour's Baptism*, exceeding all other *Baptisms* then known of, to convey the *Spirit*; and as our new *Sacramental Regeneration* under the *Gospel* is not only of *Water* but of the *Spirit*. Yet we do not find any beginning of this *Symbol* of *Unction* in the very early *Ecclesiastical Monuments*, which mention it. Nor could there have been so great a *Consent* of the *Primitive Churches* in using it, if it had descended from any other *Original* but that of *Tradition* derived from the *Apostles*, by the *Reasonings* of *Tertullian*, and *S. Augustine*, and *Vincentius Lerinensis*. The *Spirit*.

Spirit it self is called *Unction* by *S. John*, which implies it to have been given by that same *Symbol of Unction*, in that very time when *S. John* wrote that *Catholick Epistle*. For he seems to *Reason* there from the *Symbol* by which the *Spirit* was given, as *S. Paul* does from the *descent* into the *Water*, and *ascending* out of it, to the duties of *dying* and *ascending* with *Christ* in *Baptism*. And why should our Lord's having the *Fulness* of the *Spirit* be expressed by his being *anointed with the Oyl of Gladness* above his *Fellows*; but because it was the known way of giving the *Spirit* received among the *Jews* to their *Kings, Priests* and *Prophets*, to convey it by the *Symbol of Oyl*? So it was in the Case of his *Fellows*, as appears by the eldest *Monuments* next those of the *New Testament*. And it being the same Case before, under the *Old Testament*; it is hard to doubt but it must have been so in the *middle space* in Cases not *Extraordinary*, which were intended as *Precedents* for all *future Ages*. Our *Saviour's* instance was indeed *Extraordinary*, who could not receive the *Spirit* in the *Fulness* of it by any *Humane Ministry*, nor therefore by any *Visible Symbol*, being *Himself* the *Original* from whom all others, not *Men* only, but *Angels* also, were to receive it. So also was the Case of *Corneilius*, when the *Apostles themselves*, who

The Distinction between

were the *Ordinary Ministers* for giving the *Spirit*, were to be *instructed* that *God* did not look on his *Uncircumcision* as any *obstacle* against his *receiving* it, which they had not *known*, but by that *Extraordinary* way of *God's* giving the *Spirit* to *Cornelius* immediately, *without* their *Ministry*. Withal, we have exprefs *Testimonies* in the *New Testament* it self for giving the *Grace of Healing* by this very *Symbol* of *Oyl*, in the *Gospel* of *S. Mark*, and the *Epistle* of *S. James*. Why should one *single* *Benefit* of the *Spirit* be conveyed by the *Symbol* of *Oyl*, and not rather the *Spirit* it self, when it self is called an *Unction*, and the *giving* it to our *Blessed Lord* himself is called an *anointing* him? How can we better judge of the *Practice* of the *Apostles* Age, when the *Scripture History* is silent on both sides, than by so plain *Testimonies* both *before* and *after* it? In truth, it had been morally impossible for the *Governours* afterwards to have *confined* the *Conveyance* of the *Spirit* to certain *Symbols*, if they had not received them as so *confined* by *Divine Revelations* to the *Apostles*. They could not have *obliged* *God* and *Christ* to ratifie in *Heaven* what they performed on *Earth*, if they had not had *God* and *Christ's* *Authority* for connecting the *Spirit* with the *Symbol* of *Oil*. They could not then have *imposed* their own *Sentiments* on others, who

who would have thought their own *Rights* invaded by this *Confinement*, if they had *introduced* the *Confinement* without an *Authority* sufficient to justify it. The *Fact*, whether the *Apostles* had *Authorized* it, required no depth nor sagacity of *Reasoning* then to *discover* it; but was as manifest to the *meanest*, as the *ablest* Understanding. And the *nature* of it, being such as that *all* were concerned in it, made it so *notorious* as that it required no admission to *Secrets* to know whether it were so. Every individual *Member* was obliged to entitle himself to the *Spirit*; which yet he could not attain without the *Unction*, after the *Governours* (who were alone believed to have the *Power* of conveying the *Spirit*) had *confined* their *Conveyance* of it to this *External Symbol*. Indeed this *way* of conveying the *Spirit* by *consecrated Oil*, excluded all *others* from any *Right* of conveying the *Spirit* who had not the *Power* of *Consecrating* the *Oil*, by which it was to be *conveyed*. What *Mutinies* then, what *Animosities*, what *Oppositions* within, what *Scandals* without, must have followed, if any had been *excluded* from *Rights* possessed *before*? And how could they have *prevailed* that had *encroached*, when they had no *Power* to *force* their *Subjects*, but the *Conviction* of their *Subjects Consciences*, concerning their own *Right*; and

The Distinction between

where withal the *Right* it self, where-ever it was, must have been so *notorious*? How could all the different *Independent Churches* have been so *unanimous* in *owning* this Claim, if it had indeed been an *Encroachment*? It is not probable that *all* would have *yielded* their *Rights* willingly. Much less is it probable, that all could have been *forced*, by the *Practices* of *single Persons*, to *part* with them *unwillingly*, when there was no other *force* that could be offered to them, but pure Considerations of *Conscience*, granted on the *merit* of the *Cause* it self. This *Force* could not take place but where the *Righteousness* of the *Cause* was very *manifest*. However, when this *Practice* of conveying the *Spirit* by *Unction* prevailed: none could pretend to the *Divine Spirit* who had not *thus* received it. The *Bishops* alone were *owned* to have the Power of *Consecrating* the *Oil* by which it was to be administered. Thus the *Unction* of the *Spirit* could not be given without the *Bishop's* consent. Whenever the *Presbyters* gave it, they could not do it without the *Oil* consecrated by the *Bishop*. And even so they did it with a *difference* that plainly *owned* their *dependence* on the *Bishop* in doing it, besides their *use* of his *consecrated Oil*. The *Anointing* on the *Forehead* was reserved to the *Bishop*, as a *Prerogative* of his place.

This

This obliged the Persons so *anointed* to attend the *Bishop* himself afterwards, that he might *ratify* in his own *Person* what had been *before* performed by his Power only *delegated* to the *Presbyters*. And very fitly at that time when the *Baptized* Person also *ratified* in his own *Person* that same *Covenant*, which had before been transacted in his Name by his *Stipulators*. This kept the *whole Church* (the *Presbyters* themselves not excepted) in a perpetual dependence on the *Bishops* in order to their partaking of the *Union of the Spirit*. And that even in regard of the *highest* and *noblest* *Baptism*, that of the *Spirit*, without which none can make out his *Title* to any *Communion* with the *Father* and the *Son*. Perfectly, as the *Reasonings* of *S. Ignatius* and *Tertullian*, suppose in this very Case of *Baptism*. Nor can I find that even this *delegated* Power of *conferring* the *Spirit* by Oil consecrated, *not* by themselves, but the *Bishops*, was ordinarily communicated to *Presbyters*, before the *Fourth Century*. Then first we find it observed, and observed as a singularity by *Hilarius Sardus* commonly mistaken for *S. Ambrose*, and the Author of the *Questions* in the *Old and New Testament*, under the name of *S. Augustine*, that in *Alexandria* and *Aegypt* *Presbyters* did use it when there was no *Bishop* present. *Consecrate* is the word used by the one, as *con-*

signare is by the other. *Consignare* in all likelihood alludes to the *σφραγίς*, the name of the *Baptismal Spirit*, as I have already shewed in the earliest Monuments. For this *Tertullian* uses the word *signare*. So : *Caro ungitur ut anima consecretur, caro signatur ut anima muniatur, manûs impositione adumbratur, ut anima spiritu illuminetur, de Res. carn. c. 8.* So the *Signati in frontibus* in the Rites of *Mithra* are by him compared with the like Practice in our *Christian Baptism, de Præscr, c. 40.* And in *S. Cyprian : Muniatur frons ut signum Dei incolume servetur, Ep. 58. Pleb. Theb.* And the word *consignare* is thus applyed by him. *Et si fons signatus est* [He speaks of the Church] *neq; bibere inde, neq; consignari potest, cui foris posito accessus ad fontem non est, Ep. 69. Ed. Oxon.* His *signum* also is in *fronte* as before. And again, *Frons cum signo Dei pura Diaboli coronam ferre non potuit, coronæ se Domini reservavit, de Laps. & de Unit. Eccl. & ad Demetrianum. Testimon. adv. Jud c. 8.* And this is in truth the most proper *Consecration* of our Persons when the Holy Ghost is conferred upon us, which is indeed, the *Principle* of all *Personal Holiness*. This therefore being then observed as a *singularity* in the Church of *Alexandria*, seems plainly to imply, that the generality of the *other Catholick Bishops* had not then so far delegated their Power, as to enable *Presbyters*

byters ordinarily to confer the *Spirit* as their *Proxies*. It was not so in the *West*, when *S. Hierome* wrote against the *Luciferians*, as appears by his Reasonings, what *inconveniences* would follow if they had *not* the *Baptismal Spirit*, who had not received it from the *Bishops*. He needed not to have been put to that *shift*, if he could have pleaded any general *Ordinary* delegating from the *Bishops* for that purpose, which might have *enabled* them to do it, though exceeding the *Power* of their own *Order*; much less, if he could have proved their own *Order* sufficient for that purpose, *without* any such delegation. Least of all, if he could truly have pretended that this was the *received* Opinion of that *Age*. *Inconveniences alone* that must necessarily befall them who want the means *appointed* by *Christ* for attaining the *Spirit*, cannot discharge any from their *Obligation* to use such *means* if they will pretend to any *Right* to the end for which they were *appointed* by him. I know none in the *West* that *allowed* this *delegated Unction* by *Priests* with *Oil consecrated* by *Bishops*, till after this time. So clear it is, that the *Right* of conferring the *Spirit* was *Originally* in *Bishops*, and none *but* *Bishops*; and that the *Right* of *Presbyters* to do it was *later*, and no more than what they could derive from the *Concession* of *Bishops* in whom

whom it was *Originally*. This obliges all, who will pretend to the *Spirit*, to a strict *dependence* on them; and is alone *sufficient*, by the *Reasonings*, even of those *best* and *purest* *Ages*, to oblige all to *depend* on the *Bishops*, who desire a *solid* Title to the Good and Divine *Spirit*. And it will, on the contrary, be a just *Presumption* against the pretensions to the *true Spirit*, if they violate the *Unity* of the *Spirit*, who pretend to *have* the *Spirit*. That cannot be a *Good Spirit* which is derived from any but the *Bishops*, to whose disposal God has, by these *Reasonings*, *confined* the *Spirit*. That cannot be a *good Spirit*, which encourages *Divisions*, or which *weakens* the *obligation* to *Unity* thus settled by God: which makes the *Graces* of the *Sacraments* easily, and frequently, attainable without the *Sacraments*: which makes them attainable in *different* and *contradictory* *Communion*s: which makes them attainable at *Altars* separate, not only from the *true Bishop*, but from *Episcopacy* it self: which allows such *Perfection* in *this Life*, as perfectly to *supersede* the use of *Sacraments*, to entitle to the *Heavenly Communion* immediately, without any *external Communion* on *Earth*. Such *Spirits* as these cannot possibly be that *same Spirit* which unites *all* that partake of it in *one Communion*, under *one Bishop* by the firmest *Ties* of *Spiritual Interest*. They must

must therefore be *wicked Spirits*, and *Spirits of Error*, if it be a *good Spirit* that is derived by the *Ordinances of Christianity*. This is very applicable to the Case of our *Episcopal Brethren in Scotland*, whom you mention as favourable to *Mrs. Bourignon*. Yet the account given by her Admirers of her *Girls* instructed by her, that they proved *Witches*, is a particular ground of just suspicion, that it could be *no good Spirit* which she pretended to. Yet her fancy was so possessed with this *Event*, that she pretends it as a *Revelation* from *Christ* himself, that the greatest number of those who profess his Name are in *express Covenants* with the *Devil*. As extravagant was her designed journey to *Jerusalem* in *Man's Cloaths*, when she knew not on what Point of the *Compass Jerusalem* lay. It had no *Event* worthy a *Divine Inspiration*. But it might have had a very *ill one*, if the *Providence* of the *Good Spirit* had not timely interposed for preventing the ill *Consequences* of that *illusion* of the *Evil one*. How her Executor *Monfieur Poiret* can account for these things I know not; no more than I can guess, where he has concerned *me* in his *Disputes* concerning her.

Thus, I hope, I have shewn that this 60.
 Doctrine of the *Distinction* of the *Soul* and *A natu-
 rally mor-
 tal Soul is more agreeable to be joined with a naturally mortal Body,
 as a constituent of Human Nature, than a Soul naturally immortal.*
Spirit

The Distinction between

Spirit (how little soever observed in our modern *Systems*) is neither *Unscriptural* nor *Uncatholick*, but indeed more agreeable to *Scripture* and *Tradition* too, than what is advanced as *inconsistent* with it. I may now add further its greater *use* for solving the greatest *difficulties* in *Religion* now disputed, which yet were no disputes in the *Primitive Church* before the *modern Hypothesis* was thought of. It is most certain that our *Bodies* were at first created *Mortal*. There had otherwise been no more *need* nor *use*, of the difference of *Sex* then, than there will be at the *Resurrection*, when *Individuals* will be *immortalized*. The *use* of them is only to preserve the *Species* when the *Individuals* cannot be preserved. Nor had there otherwise been any *use* of the *Tree of Life* to make them *Immortal*, if even their *Bodies* had been *immortal Naturally*. But a *naturally mortal Soul* is more suitable to a *naturally mortal Body*, than a *Soul* that is *naturally Immortal*. Why then should the *Body* have been made *mortal*, even then, if the *Soul* had been *Immortal*? This would have been more easily accounted for, if the *Body* had been no *part* of our *Humane Nature*, but perfectly *præternatural* to the *Soul*, which was the *Opinion* of the most celebrated *Philosophers* and *Hæreticks* also. But this was fundamentally *destructive* of the *Opinion* of the *Catholick Church* concerning

cerning the *Resurrection*, which proceeds on the Supposal of the *Body's* being a part of the *Man*, and therefore concerned in *sharing* in the *Reward*. This being so, the *Man* is destroyed upon the *Dissolution* of the *Union* between the *Soul* and the *Body*, and is no more concerned in the State of his *separate* Parts, than his own *Body* is in the *separate Elements*, into which it is dissolved in the *Grave*. But on the *Principles* now mentioned, all things are clear. The *Mortal Body* had a *Mortal Soul* join'd to it, which, together with it, made up the *Choi-cal Man*. The $\pi\nu\omicron\eta$ or *Flatus* was *præternatural* to him, as designed to fit him for a *supernatural* State of *Happiness*. This was to cause the $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\eta$, the *Conversion* of the *Soul* to that *supernatural Principle* of the *Divine Spirit*, by *Union* with which he was to hope for *Immortality*. It was also to enable him for the $\eta\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\nu\eta\varsigma$, by which the *Union* was to be *begun*, as being it self $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\mu\epsilon\eta$ to the *Spirit*, with which the *Union* was designed. And, in the mean time, being it self also of a *Nature Divine* in an *inferiour* Sense, it self was *Immortal* also; and communicated a *derivative Immortality* to the *lower Soul*, so long as the *Union* with the *Soul* was continued; but left it *capable* of the *actual Mortality*, which was *natural* to it, whensoever it should leave it. This might be the Case at the *Day of Judgment*,
that

The Distinction between

that the *Soul* being *deserted* by the *lower Spirit*, might relapse to the *Mortality* that was natural to it, when it had now no *Body* to support it. This is a clear Account how this *wron* as distinct from the *wrebug*, might put Mankind in that *middle State* between *Mortality* and *Immortality* which the *Fathers* suppose, to be *determined* to either, by the *Event* of his own *Free-will*.

61.
By this
Distinction
on the best
& clearest
Account
may be gi-
ven of the
truly Ca-
tholick
Doctrine
of Orig-
inal Sin.

Withal, this *Doctrine* of the *natural Mortality* of the *Human Soul*, clears the *Catholick Doctrine* of *Original Sin* from exposing all *Mankind* to *Eternal Torments*, even *Infants*, for the *single* and *personal Act* of *Adam*. It was, in truth, that *new Doctrine* of the *natural Immortality*, then *newly espoused*, when the *Pelagian Disputes* began, that *forced* them upon that *Consequence*. That *Doctrine* obliged them to believe all *Human Souls* concerned in the *general judgment*, as well those that never *did*, nor *could*, hear of the *Gospel*, as those who *did*. And because they only knew of *two Sentences* then; the one to *Eternal Rewards*, and the other to *Eternal Punishments*; and they knew *such as never* heard of the *Gospel*, could not pretend to the *Rewards* of the *Gospel*; they thought the *Consequence inevitable*, that they must consequently be allotted to its *Eternal Punishments*. *S. Augustin* did not here consider, what himself

fo

so frequently grants on other Occasions, that the *contrary* Doctrine of the *Souls natural Mortality*, had then gained so great and numerous Suffrages, that even himself durst not condemn it; nor was he aware of those great and early and *Apostolical Authorities*, that allowed of *Preaching*, and *Believing*, and being *Baptized* in the *separate State*, to leave them *inexcusable* who should fall short of the *Salvation* intended for them, much more those who should incur the *Punishments* which were not intended for them, but for the *Devil* and his *Angels*. He did not consider how careful God is, where *Punishments* are concerned, especially such *irreparable* ones as admit of no prospect of a *good End*; to purge himself from all *Suspensions* of *absolute Power*, and dealing *arbitrarily*, which yet is the *Subterfuge* he found himself *reduced* to, that he might defend these *Imputations* so *dishonourable* to *Infinite Goodness*: How God *appeals* herein to *Rules of Human Equity*, even to the *Judgment* of the concerned *Persons themselves*, as far as their *Concernment* might be consistent with their *Equity*, to let them see that *themselves* alone were to *blame* for whatever they should suffer by the *Divine Sentence*, and to leave them *inexcusable*. But he did not so concern himself to enquire into *Original Tradition*, as had been requisite in a Case
of

The Distinction between

of that Importance, but contented himself with *present Authorities*, and *received Opinions*. Nor does he seem very conversant in *Primitive Christian Authors*, even when his Concern against his *Adversaries* obliged him to it. But the *Principles*, now *explained*, give an easie account of the *Catholick Doctrine*. All that *Adam's Posterity* necessarily lost by *Adam's Sin*, was only *præternatural Favour*, and the *Consequences* of it. Their being *deprived* thereby of the *immortalizing Principle*, left them only in that State of *actual Mortality*, which was *natural* to them, and which must *necessarily* have been their Lot, if *God* had not designed them for *Favours* and *Fruitings* beyond their *Nature*, to which the *infinite Goodness*, that is essential to his *Nature*, does not *oblige* him. Their not being *raised* above this *World* to a *Cœlestial* State, as it exposes them to the *Calamities* of this *World*, and to the *Power* of the *Prince* of this *World*, so far as *God* is pleased to *permit* him to *exercise* his *Power* in it, so it leaves them *capable* of all the *Happiness* in this *World*, to which their prudent *Management* may entitle them, by the *Rules* of his *general Providence*. And their *wanting* the *supernatural Principle* for *subduing* their *Passions*, may expose them to the *Sufferings* in this *World*, which are the *natural Consequences* of *unsubdued Passions*. And, even in the *other World*, the

the *habitual* Inclinations contracted by an *undisciplin'd Management* in *this Life*, may expose the *Souls*, who have them, to many *Penal Consequences* : to the *Frustrations* of the *Appetites*, and *Aversations* themselves, when they shall be *fixed* and *inflexible*, and yet no *possibility* of *satisfying* them ; to the *Indispositions* for *Heaven* and *Heavenly Pleasures*, and *Conversation* with *good Spirits*, and to *Dispositions* to *unreasonable* and *impossible* Designs, and to a *Congruity* of *Inclination* with the *curst Spirits*. Which must accordingly give *them* a more *absolute Power* over such *Souls*, during the *time* of their *Existence*, though that should *not* prove *Eternal* ; though it should *not* depress them to the *outer Darknes*, the *blackness* of *Darkness* reserved for the *Day* of the *general Judgment*. Withal, the *Loss* of the *Divine Image*, first occasioned by *Adam's Fall*, will expose all *Human Souls*, who bear his *Image* (of the *Soul* only, without the *Spirit*) to most of the *Consequences*, commonly believed according to the *received Doctrine* of *Original Sin*, excepting that of *Eternal Punishment*, which cannot be proved by any good *Authorities* before *S. Augustin* ; no, not even by those which *S. Austin* has produced for that Purpose. On the contrary, *S. Chrysostom*, as great a *Name* in the *Greek Church*, as *S. Augustin's* was in the *Latin Church*, is full *against* it ;

besides the *elder Testimonies* of *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *Tertullian*. Here is the *Darkness* of the *Understanding*, commonly observed in the *Modern Systems*, when the *Divine Spirit* is *lost*, which is called *Light*, from the *Restitution* of which *Spirit* our *Christian Baptism* has the Name of *Illumination*. Thence follows the *Power* of the *Devil* over such *Souls* when they are thus reduced within his *Jurisdiction*, being themselves *Darkness*, and within the *Darkness* of this *World*, of which the *Scripture* styles him the *Prince*. Thence follows their *Slavery* to *fleshy Lusts*, and the *Body* of *Sin* and *Death*, when they have *lost* that *supernatural Power* which could alone have enabled them to *subdue* them. Nor can any more, than these things, be *proved* by any clear *Testimonies* of the *truly Catholick Primitive Church*. Whatever is *more*, is only to be ascribed to the *conjectural Consequences* of *S. Augustin*, for which the *truly Catholick Church* ought not, by any means, to be responsible.

62. So also the *Doctrine* of *Reprobation* is easily accounted for by these same Principles. *Reprobation* in *massâ pirâ*, has no Countenance in *Scriptures*: no, nor in *Reasoning*, but by that *absolute Arbitrary Power*, which is every where *renounced* by *God* in his *Expostulations*, concerning the *Equity* of his *Proceedings* with *Mankind*. And the *Foundation* of *Reprobation* to *Eternal Torments*,

The same Distinction gives an easy account of the Doctrine of Reprobation, so far as that Doctrine is Scriptural.

ments, even in *massâ corruptâ*, is overthrown by what I have now said, to shew, that even *Adam's Sin* makes no Man, as he descends from him, liable to *Eternal Punishment*: because the *εὐὼν* derived from him, is, by the *Apostle* himself, supposed *Mortal*; and therefore cannot *qualifie* the Person, so descending from him, to *subsist* under a *Punishment* that would otherwise, in regard of the *Efficient*, by which it had been inflicted, have been *Eternal*. The most tolerable Account of this melancholy Doctrine, is that which makes *Reprobation* not a *positive Decree* for *damning* the *greatest* part of *Mankind* *eternally*; but rather a *Negative*, a *Præterition*, a *Non-election*, or *not taking* into the number of *God's Favourites* and *chosen People*. This is indeed intelligible, and reconcilable with the essential *Goodness* of *God*, if even this *Præterition* have no worse *Consequence* than the *Deprivation* of Persons, so passed by, of such *Advantages* only, as are the *Privileges* of *Favourites*. But the *Doctrine* of the *natural Immortality* of the *Soul*, makes *Eternal Misery* a *Consequence* of that *Præterition*, as *inevitable* to the Persons concerned in it, as if they had been *predestinated* to it by a *Positive Decree*. For it makes them necessarily concerned in *one* of the *Eternal States*, to which *Men*, are to be sentenced at the *final Judgment*.

The Distinction between

ment. And this for *Conditions* which God was *never* pleased to put in their *Power*, though withal he, at the same time, *knew* that they were *not*, in their *Power naturally*. In this Case, to *pass them by*, was necessarily to conclude them under the *contrary Sentence of Eternal Condemnation*. But this is easily avoided, supposing the *Nature of the Soul Mortal*. God may certainly *chuse* what *Nations* or *Persons* he *pleases*, for his *preternatural Favours*, without *derogating* from his *Attribute of Goodness*. And he may as *freely* pass others *by*, and *not admit* them. And all the *Consequence* of such a *Pretermiſſion*, in reference to *Supernatural Favours*, would be to leave them intirely to their own *Nature*, which, as it would admit of no *Immortal Enjoyments*, so neither of *Immortal Calamities*. Here is nothing *harsh*, or *difficult*, or *irreconcilable* with God's *other Attributes*.

63.
It gives
withal, the
easiest ac-
count of
the Justice
of Eter-
nal Tor-
ments.

It is also another of the *greatest Difficulties* in our *Modern Theology*, to give a Reason why the *Sins of finite Creatures* should be punished with *endless Torments*. I know the *Schools* have invented several ; but such as were as well *unknown* to the *Antients*, as they are in themselves *unsatisfactory*. I cannot now allow my self *Respite* to descend to *Particulars*. The most plausible I take to be, that which is given by *Dr. Hammond*, that of *Option*. Nor can I

see

see any thing *harsh*, if God be pleased to *oblige* us to accept of *Eternal Pleasures* under *Pain*, if we do not, of incurring *Eternal Punishments*. It is rather agreeable to his *Goodness* to *oblige* us to be happy, by such means as he knows most *efficacious* with our *reasonable Natures*. And *Punishments* are indeed so, and are accordingly *threaten'd* by all prudent *Legislators*, as the greatest *Securities* for having those *Laws* punctually observ'd, which are of the greatest *Moment* for the *Publick*. Such is the *Disingenuity* of our *lapsed Human Nature*. But then that *Reasoning* of the excellent Dr. can only take place in such Cases as are really *capable* of *Option*. Which cannot be pretended in *Infants dying Unbaptized*; nor in *Heathens*, who never heard of the *Gospel*. These could not make a *Choice* of either, who neither *knew* that it was in their *Power* to be *eternally Happy*, nor that God had *obliged* them to make a *Choice*. Much less, that he had done so on so *severe Terms*, as to make their *Neglect* of it *Pœnal eternally*. That *Hypothesis* therefore can give no reason why either of *these* should be liable to such a *Punishment*. Nor indeed, can any better *Reason* be given, why they should be so *punished*. Nor is the *Scripture* clear in either *Instance*, that it *shall* be their Case. Still it is the *received Opinion* concerning the *Soul's natural Immortality*

The Distinction between

that has perplexed our *Modern* Divines on these Subjects. But, if God be pleased to leave *both* of them to that *Mortality*, which is *natural* to both of them, there is nothing *harsh*, in either Case, that can justly be *complained* of. Yet *Infants* may have the Benefit of their *Innocence* (*Reward* they cannot pretend to) even in their *separate* State. They may thereby be qualified for *Conversation* with *good Spirits*, and *indisposed* for receiving the *Harm* of the *ill Offices* of those that are *malignant*. And those *good Angels*, whom the *Antients* believed to be intrusted with the *Patronage* of *Children* at their *Nativity*, and which our Saviour himself alludes to and owns as well as they, may as well protect them in their *separate* State, as they do in their *Bodies*, and *secure* them from being *miserable* in *either* State, though their Condition be not so *happy* as it *might* have been, if they had been *baptized*. The *Air* between *Earth* and *Heaven* (which was the *Adns* of the *Antients*.) was taken to be the *common Receptacle* of *Souls*, both *good* and *bad*, till the *Resurrection*; and of *good Spirits*, as well as *bad*, as *God* was pleased to *permit* the one or *order* the other. However, the *Devil* is the *Prince* only of the *Darkness* of the *Air*, and the *Souls* that are there, are no otherwise *subject* to him, than as they also are *Darkness*, as indeed the

the *Scripture* supposes them to be, before they are *illuminated* by the *Baptismal Spirit*. Yet that does not hinder, but that they may receive *Irradiations* and *Assistances*, and many other *good Offices*, from the *good Spirits* which are supposed ordinarily to converse *there*, as well as the *Devils*. Exactly on the same account as they did whilst they were here on *Earth*, which being *lower*, should therefore be more obnoxious to the *Power* of the *Devil*, as he is the *God of this World*. And, by the same *Reasoning*, the *Air* may have more of the *Conversation* of *good Spirits*, as being *nearer* Heaven, the place of their *constant* residence. This may make their *separate* Condition, for the time of their *Duration*, more *happy* than it *was* in *this World*, notwithstanding the *Power* the *Devil* is supposed to have over them whilst they are within his *Jurisdiction*; because his *Power* so *limited* in this *World*, is so limited by the *Laws* of *Providence*, and the *Interposition* of *good Spirits*. And indeed so *happy*, as abundantly to make *amends* for the *Infelicities* such *good Heathens* may have suffered in *this Life*, though they should *not* be *immortalized*, nor have any share in those *Eternal Rewards* which are to follow *after* the *Day of Judgment*, as the *Prerogative* of the *new Peculium*. The *Happiness* of the *intermediate* Space between

their *Death* and the *Judgment*, may sufficiently reward the Sufferings of so short a *Life*, as *ours* is, and give them just occasion to glorifie the *Bounty* of their Creator to them, though he has not been pleased to advance them to the *highest* Rank of *Favourites*: Yet, though even *this* had been necessary, which no *Attribute* can prove so: I have also shewn how *God* may, by means *unknown* to us, put it in their *Power* to attain this *greater Honour*, by allowing them the Benefit of a *Baptism* in their *separate* State, with the *means* necessary to qualify them for it, of *Preaching* and *Faith*. And for the *Fact*, that he *has* done so, I have produced great *Authorities* in the *fresh* Memory of *Apostolical Tradition*. And I have endeavoured to prove all so, as to give no *Advantage* to any who might reckon on the like *Favour now*, to the Prejudice of *Ordinary Discipline*, since that *Discipline* has been *established*. That *Extreme* ought certainly to be provided against by such as would reason solidly and prudently, as well as the other of *Uncharitableness*. It can no more be true *Charity* that is inconsistent with *God's positive Institutions*, and the *Discipline* settled by them, and that allows Men to hope for the same *Favours* in the *Neglect*, or even *Contempt*, of that *Discipline*, than it can be *Discipline* that interferes with the *Offices* of *true Charity*.

Thus

Thus I have given you, worthy Sir, my 64.
Reasons why this *Distinction* of Soul and Spirit seems to me neither *Unscriptural* nor *The Con-*
clusion.
Uncatholick : but on the contrary, more agreeable both to *Scripture*, and the Fountains of *Apostolical Tradition*, than those *contrary* Opinions or Explications which are advanced in *Opposition* to it in our *Modern Systems*. You will thereby find that most of your *Objections* proceed on a *Mistake* of the *Catholick Doctrine* and my meaning in this Matter. I think I have cleared it from those ill *Consequences* and *Scandals* wherewith you thought it chargeable. I have also shewn, what you seem to *grant*, the great *Usefulness* of it for solving several of the most *difficult Questions* in our *late Divinity* ; which might alone suffice to *recommend* it to the *Favour* of all Well-wishers to our common *Religion*, though it had no *other* Evidence of its being *true*. Yet I am willing to hear what *you* or any *other* Friend can say to convince me, if I should prove mistaken. I am (though unkown)

Yours affectionately,

HENRY DODWELL.



A
CATALOGUE
OF
BOOKS

Printed for *Richard Smith*, at the *Angel* and
Bible without *Temple-Bar* ; Where Gentle-
men may be furnished with all sorts of
NEW BOOKS that come out, and have
ready Money for any Library, of what Lan-
guage soever.

BOOKS in Folio,

Just publish'd,

Ezechielis Spanhemii Liberi Baronis & Legati
Regii Dissertationes de Præstantia & usu Nu-
mismatum Antiquorum Editio Nova. Price 2l in Q.

Georgii Bullii, S. Theologiæ Professoris & Pres-
byteri Anglicani (nunc Episcopi Menev.) Opera om-
nia ; quibus duo præcipui Catholice fidei Articuli de
S. Trinitate & Justificatione, Orthodoxè, perspicuè
ac solidè explanantur, illustrantur, confirmantur ;
nunc demum in unum Volumen collecta, ac multo
cor-

correctius quam ante; una cum generalibus Indicibus edita. Quibus jam accessit ejusdem Tractatus hactenus ineditus de Primitiva & Apostolica Traditione dogmatis de Jesu Christi Divinitate, contra Danielelem Zuickerum ejusq; nuperos in Anglia Sectatores; subnexa insuper pluribus singulorum librorum capitibus prolixa quandoq; Annotata Joannis Ernesti Grabe, hujus etiam Præfatio huic Volumini est Præmissa, Lond. 1703. Price Bound 1 l. 10 s.

The Arguments and Reports of S. Henry Pollexfen Kt. late Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, in some special Cases by him argued during the time of his Practice at the Bar, together with divers Decrees in the High Court of Chancery upon Limitation of Trusts of Terms for Years; the whole Printed from the Author's Original Manuscript. Revised and Corrected with his own hand, and publish'd with the allowance and approbation of the Lord-Keeper, and all the Judges Price, 1 l.

3. S. Orl. Bridgman's Conveyances, being select Precedents of Deeds, and Instruments concerning the most considerable Estates in England, drawn and approv'd by that Honourable Person in the time of his Practice. The second Volume carefully Corrected, to which is added a Table, and every particular Covenant noted in the Margin, to which it refers, Pr. 9 s.

4. Chirurgia Curiosa, or, the newest and most Curious Observations and Operations in the whole Art of Chirurgery, written originally in High-Dutch, by Matthæus Gothofredus Parmanus, chief Chirurgeon of the City of Breslaw in Germany, and of the Hospitals of S. Job, and All Saints. Illustrated with large Chirurgical Figures, of Patients as well as Instruments invented

vented by Dr. *Solingen*, curiously Engraven on Copper Plates. To which is added, *Natura morborum medicatrix*, Or, Nature Cures Diseases ; wherein the Energy of Nature is demonstrated, her Operations explained, and her various steps rendred intelligible. By *Conrade Joachim Sprengell*, M. Physio-didactus. Pr. 12. s.

BOOKS in Quarto.

1. The New Art of Spelling design'd chiefly for Persons of Maturity, teaching them, how to Spell and Write Words by the sound thereof, and to sound and read Words by the sight thereof, Rightly, Neatly and Fashionably, By *J. Jones*, M. D. Price 2 s. 6 d.

2. *Solon*, or Philosophy no defence against Love, a Tragi-Comedy, with the Masque of *Orpheus* and *Eurydice*, written by Capt. *Bladen*, Price 1 s. 6 d.

3. The History of the Campaign in *Germany*, for the Year 1704. under the Command of his Grace the Duke of *Marlborough* Captain General of Her Majesties Forces, with an impartial Account of the two famous Battles of *Schellenburgh* and *Blenheim*, and the Lists of the Killed and Wounded and taken Prisoners, from the time of his Grace's setting out to his Return to *White-Hall*, the second Edit. Price 1 s.

4. Good Advice to the Ladies, shewing, that as the World goes, and is like to go, the best way for them is to keep unmarried; a Satyr, with the Character of a *Beau*, Written by *Dan. de Foe*, 2d. Edit. 1706. Pr. 6 d.

5. The

5. The King of *Prussia's* Right to the Principality of *Orange*, stated ; Published by the Order of the Baron *Spanheim* 1703. Price 1 s.

English BOOKS in Octavo.

1. The Mysteries of *Opium* reveal'd, by Dr. *Jones*, Chancellour of *Landaff*, and Member of the College of Physicians, and formerly Fellow of *Christs College* in *Oxford*, Pr. 5 s.

2. Paraphrase and Annotations on all *S. Paul's* Epistles, done by several Eminent Men at *Oxford*, Corrected and Improved by the late Reverend and Learned Bp. *Fell*. Price 6s.

3. *C. Julius Caesar's* Commentaries, of his War in *Gaul* and Civil War with *Pompey*, to which is added *Aulus Hirtius Opus's*, Supplement of the *Alexandrian*, *African* and *Spanish* War, with the Author's Life, adorned with Sculptures, from the designs of the famous *Paladio*, made English by Capt. *Bladen*, Price 8s.

4. *Beaumont's* Historical, Physiological and Theological Treatise of Spirits, Apparitions, Witches, and other Magical Practices ; containing an account of the *Genii*, or, Familiar Spirits both Good and Bad, that are said to attend Men in this Life, Price 5 s,

5. The Antient Religion of the *Gentiles* and Causes of their Errors considered, the Mistakes and Failures of the Heathen Priests, and Wise Men in their Notions of the Deity, and Matters of Divine Worship, are examin'd, with regard to their being altogether destitute of Divine Revelation ; with a compleat Index. By the Learned and Judicious *Edward Lord Herbert*, of *Cherbury*, &c. Price 5 s.

6. *Boccaline's*

6. *Boccaline's Works* compleat in 5. Vol. English'd by Capt. *Bladen*, Price 1 l. 1 s. 6 d.

7. History of *Charles the Vth.* Emperour and King of *Spain*, the great Heroe of the House of *Austria*, containing the most remarkable Occurrences that happen'd in the World for the space of 56 Years, all Nations being in greater or less measure engaged in the Contests and Confusions of those times; Translated from the *Spanish*, Price 6 s.

8. Bp. of *Cambray's* Characters and, Criticisms on the Antient and Modern Orators, Poets, Painters, Musicians, Statuaries, and other Arts and Sciences; to which it added a Poem, in Blank Verse, Entitled, the Age of *Lewis the Great*, Price 3 s. 6 d.

9. Theory of Sciences illustrated, or the Grounds and Principles of the seven Liberal Arts, by *Hen. Curson*, Gent. Price 5 s.

10. Several Discourses Preached on particular occasions before the State, in the Cathedral Church of *S. Patrick* and *Christ-Church*, *Dublin*; by *Will. Sheridan*, Ld. Bp. of *Kilmore* and *Ardagh*, Price 5 s.

11. Christian Perfection, consisting in the Love of God explained, in several Letters to a Lady, Price 5 s.

12. The Vanity of Conquests and Universal Monarchy, being a succinct account of all the great Heroes both of Ancient and Modern Ages, deduced from *Nimrod* to *Lewis the XIVth.* of *France*, by *Geo. Smith*, Esq; Price 5 s.

13. *Dodwell's* Occasional Communion, fundamentally destructive of the Discipline of the Primitive Catholick Church, and contrary to the
the

the Doctrine of the latest Scriptures, concerning Church-Communion, Price 2 s. 6d.

14. — *De Schismate Anglicano Parænesis ad Exteros tam Reformatos, quam etiam Pontificios qua Jura Episcoporum vetera eorumdemque à Magistratu seculare Independentia omnibus asserenda commendantur*, Price 4 s.

15. — *Exercitationes duæ de Ætate Phalaridis & Pythagoræ*, Price 2 s.

16. — *Conference between Soul and Body*, Price 2 s.

17. *Tale of a Tub revers'd, for the universal Improvement of Mankind*, Price 1 s. 6d.

18. *Reflections of our common Failings*, Price 2 s.

Abstract of the most curious Thoughts of Signiour Montaign.

In the Press and speedily will be publish'd.

The *Alexandrian Septuagint*, Printed at Oxford, publish'd by the Reverend and Learned Dr. Grabe. PROPOSALS given out, and Subscriptions taken in by Richard Smith, at the Angel and Bible without Temple-Bar.
